

An Apology
OR PLEA
FOR THE
TWO TREATISES,
AND

Appendix to them concerning INFANT-
BAPTISM; Published Decemb. 15. 1645.

Against the unjust charges, complaints, and cen-
sures of Doctor *Nathaniel Homes*, Mr *John Geree*,
Mr Stephen Marshall, Mr *John Ley*, and Mr *William*
Hussey; together with a Postscript by way of reply
to Mr *Blakes* answer to Mr *Tombes* his letter, and
Mr *Edmond Calamy*, and Mr *Richard Vines*
Preface to it.

Wherein the principall heads of the Dispute concerning
Infant-Baptism are handled, and the insufficiency of the
writings opposed to the two Treatises
manifested.

By JOHN TOMBES, B. D.

h GAL. 4. 18.

Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?

Aug: 28 LONDON,
Printed for *Giles Calvers*, at the Black Spread-Eagle at
the West end of Pauls. 1646.

УГОЛОВНАЯ ПА

АКТИВОЯ

ЗАЧЕСТЬ

ЗАЩИТА ОУНТ

ДИА

ИМЕНІ ДОПОМОГИ ОДИНАКОВОГО АБОЛОГІЧНОГО



ІАНУАРІЙ-БРІЛІНІСЬКА СІЛЬСЬКА РАДА
ВІДЛІГЛЯЩАЯ ОДНОРОДНІСТЬ

БІЛОРУСЬКА РСР

СІЛЬСЬКА РАДА

ЛОНДОН

ПРИДАЛА МІСЦЕВІСТЬ БІЛОРУСЬКА РСР

ВІД 15 ФЕВРАЛЯ 1944 р.



To the right worshipfull my much ho-
noured Auditors, members of the Ho-
nourable, House of COMMONS, and
Societies of the Temple.



After other meanees duly but without successe tried, for the publique good, to wit the vindicating of truth, and consequently for the preventing of the establishment of an errorre and corruption of the most solemn sacred rite of the Christian profession, and the oppression of them that oppose it, I consented to the publishing of two treatises in December last about Infante-baptisme. It seemed good to sundry persons of note presently to cry downe my assertions, and to load me with unjust accusations, which I take to be rather a baffeling of the Author, then an answering of his writing. Yet the truth hath gotten so much ground (however some eminent men pretend otherwise) that the Doctrine of the Directory is disapproved by two of the most eminent of my Antagonists, as is shewed §9. pag. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. of this Apology, the chiefe argument of my prime Antagonist, is proved to be either nugatory or fallacious, §. 10. pag. 44. 45 46. 47. 48. of this Apology, sundry confessions are drawne from my Antagonists, which in my judgement, and I think in the judgement of any that knowes what belongs to disputes, do yeeld the cause, as those that I mention §. 18. pag 97. 98. 100. 101. 102. & §. 5. page 28. of this Apology. And as for the accusations against my selfe, I should slight them, were it not they had a great influence upon the cause, and therefore have been necessitated to vindicate my selfe ; and therewith the truth in

The Epistle Dedicatoy.

154

some measure by this Apology. The great prejudice against me in point of antiquity, I have also in this Apology endeavoured to dispell, specially that from the testimony of Augustin, Serm. 10. de verbis Apostoli, tom. 10. which upon examination I find not to be an historiall narration from good records, but a mere hyperbolical speech, Rhetorically asserting a thing by conjecture from present use in a Sermon to the people, §. 15. pag. 81. 82. 83. 84. of this Apology. And for the testimony of Tertullian concerning federall holiness, it is shewed to be impertinent, §. 15. pag. 84. 85. That the present Synod or reformed Churches are against me should be no more prejudice against me, then it is against the Synod, and reformed Churches that they oppose the Doctrine of Infant-baptisme, as it was taught by Cyprian, and his councill of 66. Bishops, Augustin, and many Synods, and Churches all along till the fifteenth century, and the Augustan confession art 9.

The danger of troubles upon a reformation of this corruption should make men wary how they introduce them; I think they that are bound by Covenant to reforme, yet are not bound to do it with precipitation, and without prudence. But however men must take heed how they establish an error and corruption by a Law, and oppresse men for holding a truth, lest they kicke against the Prick.

As for my owne particular, the hard dealing I have found doth not alienate me from my brethren, nor I hope shall make a schisme between us; if it must happen, my indeavour is, that it may be necessary, not voluntary on my part. What hath happened I looke upon it, however meant by men, yet as ordered by God for good, to wit the clearing of the truth, the trying and bumbling of my selfe. That I suffer in the repute of men, or my outward peace moves me not. It's not to be expected children should be born without travail, nor crush without suffering; yet to leave so intelligent an Auditory, with so much advantage of the fruite of my labours, is no small grievance. However I have chosen you for depositaries, in whose hands I may leave this Apology; that you may not be strangers to this busynesse, nor forget him who is

From my study at the Temple
in London, August 20. 1645.

Your real servant in
the things of Christ,

JOHN TOMBES.

The Contents of the Apology.

- Pag. 1. Sect. 1. Of the occasion of writing this Apology.
- Pag. 2. Sect. 2. Of the intention of the Author upon that occasion.
- Sect. 3. Of the necessity and seasonableness of publishing the two treatises about Infant-baptisme.
- Pag. 3. Sect. 4. Of freedome from publishing the two treatises contrary to engagement, with a Declaration of the Authors proceedings therein.
- Pag. 16. Sect. 5. Of the clearing the Author of the two treatises from scotfulness in writing them, of my censure of Mr Thos: Goodwins handling this point, and of all writers about Colof. 2.12.
- Pag. 38. Of the exposition I give of Colof. 2.12. confessed to be right by Mr Marshall himself.
- Pag. 30. Sect. 6. Of the clearing the Author of the Examen from either justifying the Anabaptists in Germany, or condemning the godly and grave nonconformists in England.
- Pag. 36. Sect. 7. Of the clearing of the Author of the two treatises from vaunting and challenging in the composing and publishing the treatises.
- Pag. 39. Sect. 8. Of the clearing of the Author of the two treatises from sophistry in them, whereby occasion is taken to vindicate the Treatises in many of the chiefe things contained in them.
- Pag. 40. Sect. 9. Of the meaning of M. Marshall's second conclusion, the words in the Directory [the promise is made to believers and their seed] and the doctrine therein delivered, disavowed by M. Marshall and M. Gever.
- Pag. 44. Sect. 10. Of the distinction of inward & outward covenant, & that it can stand M. M. in no stead, but to shew his trifling & equivocating in his first argument, and two first conclusions, and of master Marshall's mistake of my opinion.
- Page 49. Sect. 10. Of master Marshall's false and most unjust charge that I carry a Socinian plot through my Examen and Exercises.
- Pag. 53. Sect. 12. Of Mr Marshall's unjust charge of my itching after new opinions, and particularly about rebaptization and receiving the Lords Supper afore baptisme.
- Pag. 53. Sect. 13. Of alleging authors against their mind, particularly master Daniel Rogers master Bell, Chamier, Aretius, and Berg.
- Pag. 60. Sect. 14. Of master Marshall's unjust charging Anabaptists with a bloody sentence, condemning all the infants of believers, as having nothing to doe with the covenant of Grace, his imputing to me as it I held that they all belong accidentally to the kingdom of the devill, no more promise for them, then for children of Turks, their actuall standing in the visible kingdom of the devill.
- Pag. 67. A large disquisition of Rom. 11.27. &c. wherein is shewed that the ingrafting there is into the iayisble Church by election and giving faith, and that it proves not Infant-baptisme.
- Pag. 78. Sect. 15. Of master Marshall's unjust charge against me as darkning his argument, and casting filth in the face of the Assembly.
- Pag. 80. Sect. 16. Of master Marshall's untrue charge against me, as if I rested on Grotius in setting down the tenent of Antiquity upon occasion of which the tenent of Antiquity is again examined; my judgement of their doctrine vindicated: master Marshall's new allegations answered, and my diligence to find out their tenets manifested.
- Pag. 91. Sect. 17. Of my opinion about excommunication, Church-government, the admission unto all ordinances, my former conformity alleged to alienate mens minds from me and my writings.
- Pag. 93. Sect. 18. Of the vanity of master Leyes vaunt concerning the deadly wound given to my cause, and the contrary demonstrated by

The Contents.

- by a briefe going through the principall points about this argument, as they have hitherto been disputed. As about *Act 2. 39.* *Rom. 11. 16.* *Col. 2. 12.* *Mar. 28. 19.* *Act 16. 15.* *Mat. 19. 14.* &c.
- Pag. 97.* Baptisme and the rite of eating bread and drinking wine at the passcover, though old rites among the Jewes, yet used to another end and after another rule by christians.
- Pag. 98.* The command confessed to be the formal reason of circumcision by mr marshall. Circumcision a priviledge proper to the Jewish Church-state.
- Pag. 99.* No command about the Jewes Sacra-ments now in force.
- Pag. 100.* Infants not disciples as *Mat. 28. 19* is meant.
- Baptizing households inferres not infant-baptisme.
- Pag. 101.* We have no evidence for judgement of charity concerning infants, nor is a judgement of charity to be our rule in administering baptisme.
- Pag. 102. sect. 19.* Of master Hussey his pretended satisfactory answer to my Exercitation.
- Pag. 106. Sect. 20.* The Epilogue of this Apology concerning the reason of the enlarging of it, the Authors present estate and future intentions.
- The Contents of the Postscript.**
- Pag. 109. Sect. 1.* The occasion of this Postscript.
- a. Sect. 2.* Of M. Calamy, and Mr. Viner, their wrong judgement of the dispute, in mast. Blakes book and my discussing the point.
- P. 111. Sect. 3.* Of master Blakes charge of defect of charity, and some other imputations.
- Pag. 112. sect. 4.* They that deny infant-baptisme need not teach that infants perish.
- Pag. 113. sect. 5.* Of my censure of master Blakes producing *Gal. 4. 19.* for the birth-priviledge
- Pag. 114. sect. 6.* Of the necessity of my taking pains in my Examen to find out the meaning of master Marhalls second conclusion by reason of the ambiguity of his expressions.
- 1 Cor. 7. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16.*
- Pag. 121. sect. 2.* *1 Cor. 7. 14.* is not meant of instrumental sanctification, & federal holines.
- P. 125. sect. 9.* Of mast. Blakes misallegation of *Gal. 2. 15.* which was the text he chose for his birth-priviledge.
- Pag. 128. sect. 10.* That *1 Pet. 2. 9.* is meant of the Church invisible.
- Pag. 130. sect. 11.* Of precedents for womens receiving the Lords supper.
- P. 131. sect. 12.* To say that God hath promised to be the God of every beleever and his naturall seed is a new Gospell.
- P. 132. sect. 13.* Of master Rutherford and M. Blakes opinion about holiness of a chosen nation, and mediate Ancestours profession intitling to infantbaptisme, and the Independents advantage in this point.
- Pag. 134. sect. 14.* Of the word [nations] mast. 28. 19. how to be taken.
- Pag. 135. sect. 15.* of master Rutherford and master Blakes, and mine opinion concerning the rule to know who are baptizable.
- Pag. 138. sects. 16.* About two suppositions ascri- by me to master marshall and master Blake in my Examen, page 130.
- Pag. 140. sect. 17.* About arguments drawn from Analogy in positive rite and their invalidity, and the insufficiency of master Blakes rules.
- Pag. 145. sect. 18.* That Master Blake hath not proved that infants are disciples from *Matt. 18. 5.* nor per- niently alledged, *Isai. 49. 13.*
- Pag. 147. sect. 19.* Of baptizing households and my censure of Mr Blakes speech concerning it.
- Pag. 149. sect. 20.* About *Matt. 19. 14.* that by the king-dome of heaven is meant the kingdom of glory.
- Pag. 151. sect. 21.* That God seales not to every person that is rightly baptizized, that his covenant of grace belongs only to the elect, that his covenant is efficual, and leaves it not to mans liberty to include or exclude himselfe.
- Pag. 155. sect. 22.* Of Mr Blakes unjust crimination of me as putting the children of beleivers out of the covenant of Grace, and the Epilogue of this Postscript.

THE



I
... mind of a honest and zealous man who of course with
his friends will be ready to meet him first in a quiet and



An Apology for the two Treatises, and
Appendix to them concerning Infant-Baptisme,
against the unjust Charges, Complaints and Cen-
sures of D. Nathanael Homes, M. John Geree, and
M. Steven Marshall, and M. John Ley.



Ecember 15, 1641. were published with
my consent two Treatises, and an Appen-
dix to them concerning Infant-Baptisme.
The writing that could not in nineteen moneths before obtaine a few lines, hath
now gained foure answers in foure moneths. In January came forth a Tre-
atise of one Thomas Bakewell, in which the
Title pretends a briefe answer to my
twelve doubtfull Arguments (as he stiles them) against Infant-
baptism in my Exercitation about it. This Treatise I think hath
honour enough done it that it is named. If any man shew me any
thing worth the answering in it, it may in time gain a reply, other-
wise for me it may take it's rest. The next moneth was published
Doctor Homes his Vindication of baptizing Beleevers Infants in
some animadversions on my Exercitation and examen. The next
moneth I received from Master Iohn Geree his vindication of infant-
baptism in a full answer (as is asserted) to my twelve Arguments in
my exercitation, and whatsoever is rational or materiall in my
Answer to Master Marshall's Sermon. The next moneth I recei-
ved Master Stephen Marshall his defence of Infant-baptisme in

S. I.

Of the occa-
on of writing

this Apology.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

2

answer to my two Treatises and Appendix, in which also I am informed of two peices at least from New-England in which I am concerned. And unto all, or some of these, Master John Ley in his Epistle to Master John Salmarsh addes his acclamation in these words. *There be diverse Davids who are ready for a single encounter with that braving Goliath, and some have given her Cause such a wound already, as (though he may play the Montebanke with it and skin it over) will never be cured at the bottom.* Thus farre they have spoken: I presume they will allow me now liberty to speake for my selfe, and for the truth.

§. 2.
Of the intention of the Author upon that occasion.

My Cause (as Master Ley cals it) containes either the manner, or the matter of my Treatises. The defence of the matter of them is the chiefeſt thing, and is firſt in my intention. But the clearing of my ſelfe from ſome complaints or charges in the manner of handling the whole buſineſſe, is ſo neceſſary for the removing of prejudices, which would prevent reading and entertaining my writings, and do undermine my preſent ſtation, that I am constrained, firſt to plead for my ſelfe, before I engage further in the Controverſie: wherefore I ſhall anſwer those charges by themſelves apart, that ſo the main queſtion may be diſcussed by it ſelfe.

§. 3.
Of the neceſſity and ſeasonableness of publishing the two Treatiſes about Infant-Baptiſme.

First, Doctor Homes in his Epifle to the Reader hath these words. *Meane while I could not but lament the untimely birth of Master T. his Exercitation, and his unnecessary falling in travell with it, after at leaſt þxe able Brethren, and above ſo many daies by nervous diſputation had given him ſo much Caufe to doubt of his Temper, or at leaſt a while to ſuspend it.* And this hath been by ſundry persons objected to me, that the publishing my Booke was extreamly unfeafonable. Two reaſons are implied in Doctor Homes his words to inſinuate that it was untimely, because it was unneceſſary. Secondly, because it was after ſuch a nervous diſputation as be inſinuations.

To that of needlesneſſe I anſwer. If it were neceſſary to main-taine Truth though generally opposed, when few or none were willing to appeare for it, and ſpeciall providence called me out to do it, if it were neceſſary to endeavour the preventing of unjust perſecution for holding a Truth, to which in Sermons and other waies Law-makers, and Magiſtrates were every where iſtigated, if it were neceſſary when the people of God were perplexed about

about a poynt of conscience that pertaines to their continual practice, and disputation in publike was declined, to endeavour the bringing of Truth to light, if it were necessary for a man to keep the solemine Covenant he hath by oath bound himselfe to, though it were to his great hazzard, if it were necessary in a time of Reformation for a Minister of the Gospell to do what belonged to him to further it, if it be necessary for a Minister of the Gospell to provide for the giving of his account at the day of Jesus Christ, then it was necessary for me to fall in travell with my Exercitation and examen; for all these ends and ties concurred in the writing and publishing of my Treatises. And therefore I am assu red that what I did was so necessary, that had I not done what I did, I should neither have been faithfull to Christ, nor to his people, nor to the State, nor to my own soule. I confess my Book was untimely published in reference to my own preferment, and outward peace, I saw few or none regarded for clearing of Truth; but popular Orators, such as relate to great men, or are usefull to uphold a Party, are the men esteemed. I could not expect any other then opposition to my opinion, being against such a stream of men. But I feared that of our Lord Christ, *He that is ashamed of me and my words in this adulterous and sinfull Generation, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed when he shall come in his glory with his holy Angels.* How nervous the disputation he mentions was, I suppose the Doctor knowes not but by report, forasmuch as I never perceived him present at it. The strength, and substance of all the Arguments, as well as my memory (who was then the respondent) could beare them away, was faithfully digested by me in my Exercitation, which was composed not long after in part upon occa sion of that disputation. In which disputation I was so farre from finding cause to doubt of my Tenet, that I profess sincerely both that disputation, and the severall Answers of my learned Antagonists, and reverend brethren Doctor Homes, and Master Goree, and Master Marshall have giuen me leffe cause to doubt of my Tenet, especially sith Master Marshall Pag. 116. of his Defence saies, *it was never asserted by him, That the Covenan of saving Grace is made to Believers and their naturall seed,* and Pag. 92. *The command is the cause of the existence of the duty, but the Covenan of Grace is the moitive to it,* and Pag. 182. he grants, *that the formall reason*

4

An Apologie for the two Treatises

reaso[n] (which is the adequate reason) of the Lawes being Circumcis[ed] was the command of God, the Covenant of Grace, or their Church-state he only makes the motive to it, and the thing is related to: which with many more exceptions in his Defence, and the others Answer I doubt not, but if the Lord vouchsafe me time and liberty to improve to the overthrow of his first and maine Argument, and the inference he makes from the Texts of Scripture he bringes to confirme it, and consequently his whole Cause, as he himselfe confesseth in his Sermon Pag. 26. And for giving me cause to suspend my Fener; if he mean by suspension, stifling my doubts in mine own booke me, and never imparting them to learned men for resolution, it had been in my apprehension extreme imprudence, if not stupidity, to have let slip the opportunity of making known the reasons of my doubts in this juncture of time, in which by Covenant the State was engaged to settle worship, Catechizing, confession of faith, discipline according to Gods Word, to each of which this point is of no small moment: if he meane by suspending my Fener the not printing my writings, neither am I justly to be blamed therein, considering how long I waited, and yet never received any resolution, and after I say not, a moneth only, but ten moneths at least waiting for an answer about my motion to Master Marshall in the Epilogue of my Examen, it was plainly rejected. And though Master Marshall excusest himselfe by relating that I declared to him, that I could, and that I intimated to him I would keep the opinion private to my selfe (in which either his memory or his apprehension were defective) and therefore took no further thoughts about assuring my Treatises, yet I suppose it concerned Master Marshall for many reasons to have contrived some course for my satisfaction, or the abatement of height of pride, and confidence which the perturbation of his mind, rather then the true intelligence of my spirit in that businesse made him imagine in my writings. As for the unseasonableness in politike respects (though I do not take upon me insight therein) yet so farre as my reason is able to discern, it could never have come more seasonably, to have a matter of such moment discussed, while Reformation, and Lawes confirming it were yet in fieri, all men knowing, that it is too late to speake, when the Legislative power hath fully enacted a Law. And whereas Master Marshall faies, he verily thought I would have

sare.

concerning Infant-Baptism,

5

sat quietly down, preached, kept my opinion to myself, and not have any further appeared (especially at this time) to encrease the flame of our divisions, and confusions, I answer. For my quiet sitting down, and preaching Christ, I can boldly and cheerfully appeale to my Auditors of these Honourable Societies wherof not a few are eminent persons in the Honourable house of Commons. For my appearing at this time I have given reasons, which I suppose conscientious men will conceive weighty, yea and preponderating any divisions that may happen, if that of *Augustine* be true, *præstis ut scindunt admissum, quam dividunt animus*. Nor do I know, that any such divisions or confusions have happened by reason of my Treatises, or are likely to happen, but rather the contrary. And if any divisions be now about that opinion they were afore my Treatises were published, and if they encrease they are rather to be imputed to the violence of those Preachers, who instigate the Magistrate to extirpate such as Heretics, who hold the opinion, than to me, who by practice and profession do hold Communion with them, that differ from me, and abhorre separation from my Brethren in this regard. Nor do I doubt but that if it were not for the rigour of many Preachers, a way might be found for Reformation in this matter without such a flame of division and confusion, as Master Marshall apprehends. But I wish that as in Germany the rigidnesse of some men was the destruction of the Protestants there, so it happen not in like manner in England.

Another objection I meet with is, that I have printed my Treatises contrary to the intimation, or (as some allege) promise I made to Master Marshall: which Master Marshall writing to me thus expresseth Pag. 1, 2. of his Defence. But when after some friendly conference with you, you declared to me, that if you might enjoy liberty to exercise your Ministry in some place, where you should not be put upon the practice of baptizing of Infants, you could (yea and intimated so much that you would) keep this opinion private to your selfe, provided only, that if any should preach in your pulpit for the baptizing of them, you should take your selfe bound in the same place to preach against it; otherwise mens preaching or printing abroad should be no provocation to you. And Pag. 244. Master Marshall saith thus. For everto New-England have some sent your writings, and sufficiently in them shewed your scorne of Master Thomas Goodwin,

S. 4

Of freedome
from publi-
shing the two
Treatises con-
trary to en-
gagement,
with a Decla-
ration of the
Authors pro-
ceedings
therein.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

Master Vines and my selfe, as our friends do from thence write unto us.

That I may clearly and fully answer this charge, and the former, and state my selfe, and proceedings right in the thoughts of men, I think it necessary to make this following Declaration. It hapned that in the yeare 1627. reading the Catechisme Lecture at *Magdalen Hall* in *Oxford*, and having occasion in one of my Lectures to examine whether there be such a privilege to the children of Beleevers, that they should be accounted to belong to the Covenant, and Church of God, I found not sufficient ground either from *Gen. 17.7.* or from the institution of Circumcision for the affirmative in that question. The substance of my reasons then against the Argument drawn from Circumcision to baptisme, I have compacted in that short discourse, which is part. 2, §. 8. Pag. 29. of my Examen, and begins at those words, I dare not assent &c. Which being the chiefe thing I stand upon, I wonder Master *Marshall* so lightly passeth over calling it a tedious discourse, altering my words, and saying nothing to the reason I bring. Wherfore then, and since I declined the urging of those reasons for it, and wholly rested on *1 Cor. 7.14.* conceiving that those words [*but now are they holy*] did import that privilege to the children of a Beleeving Parent. And accordingly practised baptizing of Infants upon the warrant of that Text only, as I often told my Auditors at *Lemster* in *Hereford-shire*, which some now about the City can witnessse. It happened after I was necessitated to leave my place through the violence of the Kings Party, after much wandring up and down with much danger to me, and mine. I came to the City of *Bristol*, and there preached for halfe a yeare, in which time in dispute with an Antipardonbaptist, I urged that Text *1 Cor. 7.14.* which he answered with so much evidence, as that although I did not fully assent unto him, yet as one that durst not oppose Truth who ever brought it, I resolved with my selfe to consider that matter more full, and to that end being enfeebled with labour in preaching, and griefe by reason of the publike losses at that time, and advised by my Physitian to remove out of *Bristol*, understanding the Assembly was to sit in *July 1643.* I resolved to adventure a journey to *London* through *Wiltshire*, to conferre with my Brethren of the Assembly, and by the advantage of Books in

London

London to make further search into that point. It pleased God to stop my journey then by that sad, and unexpected overthrow neere Devizes, which necessitated me to get away from Bristol by Sea into Pembrokeshire. While I was there I chanced to meet with *Vossius his theses de pædobaptismo*, and therin reading *Cyprianus* and others of the Ancients Testimonies, I suspected that in point of antiquity the matter was not so cleare as I had taken it, but weighing those passages, I conceived that the Ancients held only baptizing of Infants in the case of supposed necessity, conceiving that by baptism Grace was given, and that all are to be saved from perishing and after in processe of time it became ordinary.

Wherefore I resolved if ever I came to London, to search further into those two points of the meaning of 1 Cor. 7.14. and the History of Pædobaptisme, and accordingly God having brought my wife and children with much difficulty to me after a second plunders, and by remarkable providence turning the wind against the Ships when they went without us bringing us out of Pembrokeshire the day before it was appointed by the Kings Forces to send to apprehend me, making the wind serve for a speedy voyage in four dayes from Milford Haven to the Downes, presently upon the receiving us into the Ship (which I hope I shall ever remember to the praise of our God) being come to London September 22. 1643. I applied my selfe to enquire into the points forenamed. It happened that whereas I had this prejudice against the interpreting of the holiness of the children 1 Cor. 7.14. of Legitimation that no learned Protestant had so expounded it, meeting with *Camerarius* his notes not long before printed at Cambridge, I found him of that opinion, and after him *Musculus* and *Melanchthon*, and finding that the Sanctification in the forepart of the verse, must be understood of lawfull copulation, exprested by Beza thus, *Fidelis uxor potest cum infideli marito bona conscientia confuscoye*, which sense only was suitable to the case resolved by the Apostle whether they might still continue together, I observed that the Apostle speaking of the unbelieving party mentions his unbelief, but when he mentions the Believer, expresseth only the relation of husband and wife, and that the reason of the Apostle to prove their lawfull copulation is an Argument ab absurdo and including this proposition. *All those children whereof one of the parents is not sanctified*.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

sanctified to the other by lawfull copulation are uncleane, which being expounded of fedell uncleaneesse were false, and is only true of bastardy, I concluded, that it was the meaning of the Apostle, and could be no other. Whereupon when in a meeting of Ministers in the City of London, the question was propounded what Scripture there was for Infant-baptisme, I told my Brethren plainly, that I doubted there was none. This occasioned the Dispute Doctor *Homes* speakes of which happened about January 1643. Concerning which though some gave out I was satisfied by it, others that I was so convinced, that I had nothing to say, yet the truth is, this was all the ground of those reports, that having at first stood upon it that [nisi tibi, of such *Math. 19.14.*] was meant only of such like, it being urged that then it could not be a reason, why they should suffer those children to be brought to Christ, I yeelded that it was to be expounded as *Ber.* expounded it, *horum & similiam ut supra,* as I expresse in my Exercitation, and further granted that if when Christ saith [*of these is the Kingdom of God*] he meant of their present state of regeneration they might be baptized, but that our Saviour meant it of their present state I did not grant: and I further yeelded that I should not sticke at the baptisme of an Infant concerning whom I should be certified from God that it was actually regenetrate, and believing, meaning no more but this, that such a certificate would warrant me in such a case to baptize, it being all one with a profession of faith, as signes made by a dumbe person that he was a Christian would warrant his baptisme. This concession being made merely upon a supposition of an extraordinary revelation, first Master *Blake*, and after him Master *Marshall* have often urged, though they have been often tould, that a common rule cannot be drawn from an extraordinary case. Not long after that Conference, my most loving and reverend Father in law Master *Henry Scudder* fearing the event of this matter, after some writing that past between us, advised me to draw up the reasons of my doubts, and he undertook to present them to the Committee chosen (as I conceived it) to give satisfaction about that point, which I conceived might well be by the leave of the Parliament, as the appointing the Assembly to give satisfaction about some doubts in taking the Covenant. And if the Committee as a Committee could not do it (which

(which I suppose they might have done by communicating what after debate was prepared for the Assembly, which I presume was, certainly it should have been accurately done with examination of what could be objected, afore those Articles in the Directory about this matter were passed) yet particular members might have done somewhat to satisfie me, who wold have been then, and shall be yet satisfied with one convincing argument, that it was Christs appointment, that the Infants of Beleever, because they are borne of Beleever are to be baptized. According to the advise given in a short space, I first drew up the nine first Arguments in my Exercitation, which were delivered as I relate in my Examen in February and March 1643. and after in July following, the other three. Which I said in my Examen were delivered to Master *Tuckney*, but Master *Marshall* tells me he doth deny it, yet I conceive my Father *Sndder* told me so, who I am sure would speake truth, and when I read that to him he did not correct me in it, and Master *Thomas Goodwin* still saies he had them after Master *Tuckney* had perused them. Besides these Papers, that satisfaction might more compendiofusly be given me at the motion of my reverend Father in law, I set down in one page of a Paper in quarto, the maine ground of my doubt, and delivered it to him, whether he communicated it to any else I know not: my end was that satisfaction to me might more easily be procured. This short thing I after put in my Examen, Part. 2. §. 8. as I said above, which Master *Marshall* calls a tedious discourse, though it containes lesse then forty lines, and if it had been well answered, might have eased Master *Marshall* of the rest of his labour. Now the Papers before named, I perceived were tossed up and down from one to another, and it seemes Master *Edwards* the Controversie Lecturer at Christ-Church got them, and picking out some passages, but concealing others that would have cleared them under pretence of refuting them, with the writing of another which he joyned with mine, meerly abused me in the Pulpit at Christ-Church: which I immediately charged him with after his Sermon in the Vestry, and he only excused it by telling me he named me not, though there were sundry Ministers there that knew he meant me. But this it seemes is like Master *Edwards* his justice to other men. In this time I attended Master *Thomas Goodwins* Le-

An Apologie for the two Treatises

10

tures about that Argument, had the patience to heare Master *Edwards* his discourse at *Christ Church*, and read many Treatises and Sermons, in many of which I found rather invectives than arguments. It happened that the Parishioners of *Fanchurch* became disaffected to me, and refused to heare me, though I medled not at all with that matter in the Pulpit, and I perceived my maintenance was likely to be withdrawn at the end of the yeare. Hereupon one of the Assembly my loving friend, understanding that the Honourable Societies of the *Temples* wanted a Preacher, sollicited the bringing of me thither. But the matter was by the Honourable House of Commons referred to the Assembly, who chose a Committee to nominate a Preacher for them, of which Committee Master *Marshall* was one, by whom I was rejected. Presently after which rejection, having occasion of busynesse in the behalfe of some godly *Pembroke*shire Ministers, with that worthy Gentleman Master *John White* Chaire-man of the Committee for plundered Ministers, he would needs argue with me about that point of *Infant-baptisme*, and after some dispute, he desired to have my answer to his argument in writing. Which occasion I tooke to lay open my condition to him in a Letter, which begot no other fruit but a little Treatise intituled, *Infants Baptisme proved lawfull by Scripture*. Shortly after in *August 1644*, I met with Master *Marshall's* Sermon, and finding the vehemency of his spirit against Antipædobaptists, and having had experience both of his, and Master *White's* inflexibleness by my former writings, and seeing no likelihood of imployement and maintenance for me and mine, except I would gather a separated Church, which I durst not do, as not knowing how to justifie such a practice, I resolved to make a full answser to Master *Marshall's* Sermon, and finished it *November 11.* and having with much difficulty transcribed one Copy, and gotten another written for me, I sent my own to Master *Marshall*, who received it *December 9 1644*. About a fortnight after Master *Marshall* sent me word, that he would find a time to speake with me: I sent him word, that for the returning answser to my writing, I would not straiten him; but forasmuch as by his rejecting me I missed being nominated to the *Temple*, and I was then brought to great straights, I requested that he would declare as occasion shold offer it selfe, whether he held
me

me fit for the Ministry or not; notwithstanding my dissent from him in that point. His answer was, he desired to know first whether I would keep my opinion to my selfe. I returned this answer in writing by my Father Scudder. *I request you to returne this answer to Master Marshall, that whereas I requested him to declare whether he thought me fit for the Ministry or not, notwithstanding my dissent about Paedobaptism, and he demands of me a promise of silence in that point, I conceive he is bound by the rules of justice, mercy, and prudence to do it without requiring that condition, and that he hath no reason to be jealous of me considering my carriage in this matter.* Nevertheless when I shall understand what promise he would have from me, and what is intended to be done by him for the discussing the point, and clearing of Truth, to which I ought not be wanting, and what advantage I may have by his agency for my imployment and maintenance, I shall give him a punctuall answer, and am resolved for peace sake to yeeld as farre as I may wihout violating the solemn Covenant I have taken, and betraying truth and innocency. *Decem. 26.* This begat the friendly conference mentioned by Master Marshall, which was *Decem. 30. 1644.* in the morning afore the Assembly sate. At the very beginning of that Conference, Master Marshall having this last written message in his hand, & reading those words, [and he demands of me a promise of silence in that point] told me that he did not demand of me a promise of silence in that point; for that was beyond his line: this was his very expression. As soon as ever I heard those words, I conceived my selfe freed from the snare I most feared of making a promise, which as the case might stand, I could not keep with a good conscience. Then Master Marshall spake to this effect, that yet for the satisfaction of those who should enquire of him concerning me, he desired to know my intentions. Whereupon I dealt freely, that I intended not to publish my opinion in the Pulpit, if I might be where I should not be put to baptize: for I conceived it not likely, that there would be a Reformation of that thing in this Age, there having been so long a practice of Infant-Baptisme, and such a prejudice in men against the opposers of it: yet I told him that if any should preach to that people I had charge of, that which I conceived to be an error, I did resolve to oppose it there, otherwise other mens preaching abroad should be no provocation to me: So that it is cleare, I made

An Apologie for the two Treatises

no promise, and that intimation of mine intentions which I made was only, that I intended not to preach my opinion in that place unlesse provoked there. And this any man may perceive was my meaning by Master *Marshalls* owne relation, in which the proviso is rightly expressed ; *That if any shoulde preach in my Pulpit for baptizing Infants, I tooke my selfe bound in the same place to preach against it, otherwise mens preaching or printing abroad shoulde be no provocation to me* ; to wit, to preach that opinion in that place. And whereas Master *Marshall* alleadeth this for his *Quicquid est*, he might have remembred, that I told him in expresse termes, that if Lawes were likely to be enacted to make the deniali of Infant-Baptisme penall, I held my selfe bound in conscience to appeare in publique about that matter : yea, and Master *Marshall* told me he intended me some animadversions on my *Examen* ; whence it may be collected, that neither Master *Marshall* nor my selfe had agreed to lay aside the dispute it selfe. It is true, Master *Marshall* did endeavour to possesse me with this, *That Reformation of Congregations might be without altering the use of Infant-Baptisme.* To which I answered, that though much might be done other wayes, yet it would never be right, till Christ's way of baptizing were restored. About two houres after, Master *Marshall* comming to me, in the presence of Master *Obadiab Sedgwick*, repeating the intimation of my intention aforesaid, with the proviso, told me, *he would give testimony in my behalfe as I desired.* Upon this I parted with Master *Marshall*, and Master *Sedgwick* walking with me, commended my proceeding in that matter, and made a notion to me, which came to nothing. Upon this I went home very chearfull, not only because I prized amity with Master *Marshall*, and there was a likely way of my imployement and maintenance ; but chiefly because I was freed from that I feared, as a snare, the promise of silence, and there were great hopes that my brethren in the Ministry would not be rigid in ejecting out of the Ministry and Communion, those that dissented from them in that point, and so separation and mutuall persecution might be prevented (which was and is still the great feare that possesseleth my spirit) and liberty might in time be given for the shining forth of the light in this thing, and by degrees Reformation might be perfected, which I conceived the only safe and happy way. Upon these

these considerations I acquainted sundry of my near friends with this mercy of God to me, and being requested to joyne in keeping a day of Thanksgiving at Antholins, January 1. following for publique mercies, I made a speciall memento in my booke of speciall passages of my life, to blesse God that day for the conference I had with Master Marshall in peace and amity : What Master Marshall did after for me I do not well know, I beleeve he did as he promised, and after a triall of me three Lords-daiies at the Temple, I was in the end of January chosen by the Treasurers, and and sundry others of the members of both the honourable Societies of the Temples to be their Preacher for a yeare.

After these things, being acquainted with a Law made in New-England, and proceedings against those that denied baptizing of Infants, I yeelded to the sending of my Examen thither, though not so large as it is now printed (for the dissertation about a speech of Master Cotton Part. 3. Sect. 3. Pag 42, 43. and some other things were added since) meerly to occasion the study of this matter more exactly, and to allay the vehemency of their spirits, and proceedings against those that dissented from them, and therewith I sent this short Epistle.

To all the Elders of the Churches of Christ in New-England, and to each in particular, by name to the Pastor and Teacher of the Church of God at Boston there these present.

Reverend Brethren,

Vnderstanding that there is some disquiet in your Churches about Pædobaptisme, and being moved by somewhat honour you much in the Lord, and desire your comfortable account at the day of Christ, that I would yeeld that a Copy of my Examen of Master Marshall his Sermon of Infant-Baptisme might be transcribed to be sent to you I have con-

An Apologie for the two Treatises

14

sented thereto, and do commend it to your examination in like manner, as you may perceive by the reading of it I did to Master Marshals; not doubting but that you will as in Gods presence; and accountable to Christ Jesus weigh the thing, remembraunce that of our Lord Christ, Joh. 7.24. Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgement. To the blessing of him who is your God, and our God, your Judge, and our Judge I leave you, and the flocke of God over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, and rest,

From my study at the Temple
in London, May 25. 1645.

Your Brother and fellow
servant in the worke of Christ,
JOHN TOMBES.

The accounting of this act a shewing of my scorne of Master Thomas Goodwin, Master Vines, and Master Marshall, I take rather to be the effect of a distempered palat, than a right-discerning taste.

After this, sundry things happened which did induce me to yeeld to the importunity of those that sollicited earnestly the publishing of my writings for the publike good. I had sent to Master Marshall after his returne from Scotland, to know what he would do about the motions I made in the Epilogue of my Examen, for the discussing of the point in difference between him and me. The best of the answer I received was, that *such I had now a place for my Ministry without baptizing Infants, he expected I would be quiet.* About that time I had occasion to make triall of the Assemblies approbation of me. The Examiner told me, *that there were many of the Assembly that did scruple in Conscience, the giving approbation to me because of my opinion.* The Directory had been published, and an Ordinance of Parliament to make the not using it penall. Preparations were to send Bills to the King, among which I assured my selfe that would be one, which if once past, it would be

be too late to make an afterplea. The Sermons in publique were still as earnest against this tenet as ever. The people of the City much enquired into this matter. A publique disputation was once allowed about it, to which I was earnestly solicited, but for weighty reasons refused it. Sundry came to me to request the perusal of my papers for their satisfaction, many learned, godly, and prudent persons, both of them that differed in judgement, as well as those that agreed with me, moved me to have them printed, for the bringing of truth to light. I saw not wherein any danger to the State or Church might be created by the printing of them, and which was beyond all to me, I was confirmed it was a truth I held, had tried all fit meanes to have it examined, had been guided in the searching of it, and preserved for this busynesse by many remardeable providences, and thereupon after prayer to God by my selfe, and with others for his direction, I yeelded to the printing of them, *not out of a restlesse spirit to vent my selfe, as Master Marshall imagined, nor out of any mind to encrease the divisions and confusions of the time* (then which there is nothing my spirit and waies more abhorre) but to vindicate truth, performe my duty to which I was bound by solemne Covenant, to do my best for the preventing of that sad evill of removing out of the Ministry, and out of Communion, and out of the State also them that could not yeeld to Infant-Baptisme, which is more likely then any thing to encrease our divisions, and make tumults, especially if the relations, and instigations of some fiery spirits prevaile. And in this, I doubt not but I have dealt faithfully to God and to the State, and charitably to other men, without violating any engagement, what ever I suffer in mine owne person. I must confessie had I seen any inclination in the Assembly, or Master Marshall, or other leading-men to examine my writings in a faire Scholaſtike way, and had I had meanes to be able to beare the charges of an impression, and no Lawes likely to be established to make the holding of my opinion penall, I had resolved not to publish my writings in *English*, but in *Latine*, and therefore I first framed my Exercitation in *Latine*, conceiving the Assembly would have apprehended my aime and intention, to be to deale only with Schollars in this matter: but all things falling out crosse to my expectation, I conceived it was the will of God it should be printed as it was. Thus much for

the

An Apologie for the two Treatises

the justifying the publishing of my Treatises..

§ .5.
Of the clearing the Author of the two Treatises from scornfullnesse in writing them: of my censure of M. Thomas Goodwins handling this point, and of all writers about Colof.

2. 12.

The next charge against me is my abusing my Antagonists. And in this Master Geree in his Epistle to the Lord Mountaigne speakes thus.

The Author whom I answer, bath used his opponents more courstly then was convenient to their worke, and places. But all men count his sleightings of opponents a blemish to his worke. Master Marshall in his Defence, Pag. 244. For even thither have some sent your writings, and sufficiently in them shewed your scorne of M. Thomas Goodwin, Master Vines, and my selfe, as our friends do from thence write to us. And Pag. 53. I alledge all this to shew, you shoulde not thus vilifie and scorne their (meaning the Ancients) practice and groundes, as if the Century writers, and generally all Protestant writers, yea Master Marshalls owne friend, it I mistake not, Theophilus Philokyriaces Lancadiensis in his Dies Dominica, when they note the naeviquilia blemishes, and errors of Fathers, and Councils did vilifie and scorne them: which if it be an uncharitable imputation to them, it is so to me, unlesse it be thought that men cannot conceive bad enough of an Antipædobaptist. Pag. 62. throughout your whole Treatise you strive to make an ostentation of reading, and put abundance of scoffes and jeeres upon them who are of contrary mind to you. Pag. 76. You powre out such abundance of scorne upon them, who think otherwise then you do. I answer, 1. That the words interpreted as scoffing & scorning, and jeering are not such, but usuall School-expressions frequent in Schooles, and in the most temperate writings of the most moderate men of the same profession, towards them that dissent from them, so that I assure my selfe, had not my Antagonists before distasted my worke, and consequently the Author, they would not have been so construed. How ever Master Geree lay all men count my sleighting opponents a blemish to my worke, yet one I am sure commended my writing for the contrary, that I had discovered the weaknesse of the opponents by such expressions, nor did my Father Scudder except against those passages as offensive which Master Marshall doth, though more then halfe was read to him, and observed by him of purpose to avoid offence, afore it was sent to Master Marshall. 2. That there were many reasons why Master Marshall should have otherwise conceived of me in those expressions, as namely my Declaration of

my

my intention, and petition thereupon in the prologue of the Examen, Part. 1. Sect. 1. my respective speeches of Master Marshall in the same place, Pag. 2. and Part. 2. Sect. 7. Pag. 26. and also in the Epilogue, Part. 4. Sect. 8. And if Master Marshall had remembred it, when in our friendly conference he had told me, he did not expect so high expressions from me, which I conceived he meant of my downright censuring of his Arguments, not contemning his abilities, and I told him I conceived it necessary to do so, because he called his Arguments undeniable, and had charged the Anabaptists with a bloudy sentence, I desired an instance of such an expression as was offensive, which being given by Master Marshall, I left those words out in the printed Book, and would have dealt so with any other, had I conceived it would have been so construed. I might adde further, that when Master Gere came to me the day he published his Booke, a moneth afore Master Marshalls Defence came forth, I told him he did not conceive aright of me in that charge in his Epistle Dedicatory, and gave him my reason, and told him that I might have much wrong by it and desired that intimation might be given to Master Marshall thereot. Which whether he did or no I know not, but I supposed it might have occasioned Master Marshall if he could not alter his Copy, yet to have added something in the beginning or end of his Book, to have allayed the asperity of that charge. But what are those passage in which I powre out such abundance of scorne on Master Vines, Master Thomas Goodwin, and Master Marshall? All the passage of Master Vines thus interpreted is Examen, Part 2. Sect. 6. *But how knowes Master Vines this? I do not take Master Vines for a Prophet, and to inferre this by reason, The Anabaptist is geth Matth. 28. 19. against pedobaptisme, Ergo he will urge Rom. 12. 19. against Magistracy, is in my slender apprehension a baculo ad angulum.* He had said, *the Anabaptist which urged Matth. 28. 19. against pedobaptisme when we shall be thriven to his full stature, will undermine Magistracy by Rom. 12. 19.* Which words seeme to imply, that an Anti-pædobaptist is but a young Anti-Magistrate, and that the same vegetative faculty, that is the same reason that did nourish the one would beget the other. This inference being unreasonable, yet spoken to such an Auditory by a man of such eminency at such a time, and therefore tending to the suppression of Truth, and them

18

An Apologie for the two Treatises

that held it, I conceived it necessary to blunt the edge of it, without any scorne of him, whom I respect as my loving neighbour, but for necessary defence of truth, in a Schoole expression used by many Protestant writers, and among others, by Master Garaker in his Rejoynder to *Can* in defence of Master Bradshaw, Pag. 113. As for Master Thomas Goodwin it is true, Part. 3. Sect. 7. Pag. 58. of my Examen I said thus. *I remember Master Thomas Goodwin, who hath handled this matter of Paedobaptisme, by spinning out similitudes and conjectures (fit indeed for the common people that are more taken with resemblances then syllogismes) rather then with close Arguments.* In this passage saies Master Marshall, Pag. 143. *I stepped out of the way to reproach Master Thomas Goodwin, that I vilifie him as a man who by spinning out similitudes, and conjectures deludes his Auditory with such things rather then with satisfactory arguments, that why like Ishmael my Sword should be against every man he cannot tell, that he knowes him to be a learned godly Divine, and an eminent Preacher of the Gospell of Christ, and his worth not to be blasted by my scornefull speeches, that I have set down his Notions otherwise then he preached.* To all which I answer. That passage of mine was not to vilifie Master Goodwin, but to passe a right censure on his Sermons, as I did in like manner on Doctor Fealies Treatise, Pag. 143. without any vilifying of his learning, because I saw the esteem of them held men in error. Which is so frequent, and just a thing, that it was held meet that an Advertisement should be added to the new Annotations on the Bible, to prevent the danger of some passages in favour of the Prelacy and Liturgie. *Hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim.* And this fact of mine is most injuriously construed, as if I did this like an Ishmael that loved to have my Sword against every man, as it I affected contention: then which there could not be a thing more falsly charged on me, though in pursyance of truth I held my selfe bound to examine every mans sayings, which I tell Master Marshall in the Epilogue of my Examen, to be for exact disquisition of it. Doctor Twisse in his *Vindiciae gratiae* against Arminius often makes digressions, and doth *vocare ad partes Molinensis, Piscator, Lubbertus, Alvarez, &c.* He writes against Doctor Jackson, Master Cotton, &c. Master Garaker against Doctor Ames, Voetius, Balmford, Lucius, Gomarus, Master Walker &c. doth any man therefore make them like Ishmael whose sword

Sword is against every man? Master Marshall saies that I vilifie Master Thomas Goodwin as a man who by spinning out similitudes and conjectures deludes his Auditors, and then gives him an *Eccomium*, in which he would have it believed that I charged Master Thomas Goodwin as a man wont to do thus, whereas my words are only concerning that matter of Paedobaptisme, which doth nothing prejudice him in his other workes, of which I have in my Examen, Pag. 163. given an *Eccomium*. And for my censure, it was grounded partly on his own expreſſions, that in fudry points pertaining to that matter we must be content with him, which is all one with conjectures, and partly on the maine principles of his dispute; which were, that forasmuch as the promises to Beleevers children are indefinite, as Acts 2. 39. Luke 19.8. God hath ſo cast the order of his election, that multitudes come out of the loynes of his people, that administration of the Lords Supper and Baptisme is to be by a Judgement, that we are to judge any Infant-children of Beleevers to be holy by parcels, though not all in the lumpe, that they are therefore to be accounted holy with a reall ſaving holinesſe, 1 Cor. 7.14. Matth. 19. 14. and therefore to be baptized according to the rule implied, Act. 10.47. Concerning which I lay ſtill that I expected Arguments, but counted my ſelfe deluded with these conjectures, as finding nothing to his purpose in any of theſe Texts, which were the maine he alleadged, they neither proving that God had ordered his election ſo as for the moſt part to run through the loynes of Beleevers, nor that we are to judge any of the Infants of Beleevers to be in the Covenant, or Elect by parcels, though not all in the lumpe, nor that Baptisme is to be administered by ſuch a conjecturall or uncertaine judgement. But forasmuch as I have diſputed at large in my Examen, Part. 2. Sect. 10. Part 3. Sect. 3. 4. about the promises to Beleevers children, and examined all the Texts forementioned, and ſhewed that we are not to administer Ordinances by our conjecturall judgement, concerning Gods Election, or inward holinesſe, God having not made that the condition of his ſervants applying his Ordinances, which can be infallibly known to none but himſelfe, as Maſter Marshall rightly in his Sermon of baptizing Infants, Page 3. but according to the certaine judgement of a perons profeffion of the faith, I ſhall not examine this thing here at large: only I

An Apologie for the two Treatises

20

thought it necessary to say thus much, not to vilifie Mr. Goodwin, but to shew the weakenesse of the Cause, for which no better proofes could be brought, then such uncertaine guesses even by a man so able as Master Thomas Goodwin, who hath in other things shewed his sufficiency beyond other men. And though I deny not but I might mistake him in some passages, or not exactly recite his words; yet I do not conceive I have misreported his Sermons, and however, and whenever they shall be printed, I hope I shall be able to produce the written notes of others to verifie my setting down his Notions; yet if I should mistake passages in Sermons not printed, it were excusable, in comparison of the usage I have met with from Doctor Homes, and Master Marshall himselfe, who in not a few places, yea I may truly say all along, do in their framing answers to my written speeches, crook my words where they are streight, and they might have discerned them so to be, had their hast in publishing their answers permitted them to ponder my writings. As for instance: Master Marshall had averred that the Christian Church hath been in possession of Infant-baptisme for the space of 1500. yeares and upwards, I replyed, that if it were true, yet it is not so much as may be said for Episcopacy, &c. And after, For antiquity not Apostolicall, there are plaine testimonies of Episcopacy, &c. being in use before any of the testimonies you or any other can produce for baptizing of Infants. Now M. Marshall in his Defence, Pag. - 8. First sets down my words thus, As much may be said for Episcopacy, &c. That there are plaine testimonies for Episcopacy &c. before any testimonies can be produced for the baptizing of Infants, and then tells me, that the Ancients testifie that the baptizing Infants was received in all ages, and from the very Apostles as a Divine Institution, no such thing of Episcopacy, if I can make it good, I shall do a very acceptable service to the Papists, Anabaptists, and Prelaticall party, if I cannot, I should do well to revoke that bold assertion. In which Master Marshall deales not candidly with me, when I had said, if it were true, yet it is not so much as may be said for Episcopacy, (meaning that which he had said) the Church hath been in possession of Infant-baptisme 1500. yeares and upwards, Master Marshall sets down my words, as if I had said, as much may be said for Episcopacy, and in the latter passage leaves out the words [Antiquity not Apostolicall] and [being]

[being in use] and then insinuates, as if I had asserted, that the Ancients say as much for the Divine Institution of Episcopacy as for Infant-baptisme. Whereas I only spake of the possession and being in use, nothing of the Divine Institution, and my assertion is so manifest, that even the advertisement at the end of the New Annot: on the Bible, confesseth it a custome very ancient, and neere the Apostles time, as Chamier truly acknowledgeth, Lib. 10. c. 6. de Oecumenico Pontifice, Tom. 2. Pag. 353. Molin in his Epistle to Bishop Andrewes, (if my memory deceive me not) confessed it to have been ab ipsis Apostolorum temporibus. And I conceive Master Marshals leaving out in his proposition of the first part, [as now caught] which was in mine, and framing it thus, in opposition to mine [Infant-baptisme no late innovation] may occasion an unwary reader to conceive I had simply asserted it to be a late innovation. Now this course, though it may perhaps not prejudice my writings with those that are able and willing to take paines to compare together writing with writing, yet the greatest part either through want of leasure or skill, or through disaffection to me or mine opinion, or through a secure resting on Master Marshals word neglecting it, it is a great injury to me, and to the Truth, As for Master Thomas Goodwins Sermons of Infant-baptisme, whether my censure of them, or Master Robert Bayly one of the Scottish Commissioners charge in his Dissuasive, Cha. 6. Pag. 119. do more dilparage them or him, I leave it to Master Marshall's, Master Goodwin's and their friends consideration. It hath been excepted against me that I say, Pag. 139. of my Examen, which if he can apply to Infants, erit mihi magnus Apollo, which is no worse then what Master Gataker hath animadv. in Luci: Part. I. Sect. 8. Pag. 22. Inter iustum & insolentem qui distinctionem instam dederit. erit is mihi magnus Apollo: and that I have said Master Goodwin dictated at Bow, which is so harmelesse an expression, that even the preface to the new Annot: and the advertisement call their writings, their dictates.

Let us consider the scorns put upon Mr. Marshall. When I urged Mr. Geree in private conference to instance in particulars, wherein I had dealt courfely or slighted my opponents, expecting he would have shewed me where I had falsified their words, or belyed, or derided their persons; instead of any such matter he

An Apologie for the two Treatises

22

allegedgeth that passage, part 3. of my examination, pag. 36. of which Mr. Marshall, pag. 94 of his defence sayes, *This you* ~~will~~ *away with scorne*, affirming it to be *an easie answer*, because *it is easie to be answered*; which possibly may be thought to have some lepidity (which is sure but a veniall sin in one tired, as I was with hewing at such a knotty piece as Mr. Marshalls Sermon) but how it should be *a casting of scorne* I see not. In the same place Mr. Marshall sayes, *I make my selfe merry with the word virtuall*, as if the examining the sense of a distinction, were making metry with it, pag. 103. He sayes, *I wonder you should seeke to cast an odium upon my expression* (*as you doe here, and severall other times*) *by saying it is a joyning with Arminius.* I answer, where I said he joynes with Arminius, I conceive still I said right; not to cast an odium upon his expressions, but to shew the error of them. And for that particular I charged Mr. Marshall with, in calling Proselytes, who sought justification by the works of the law *Abrahams seed*, he joyns with Arminius in his Analysis, c. 9. ad Rom. and opposeth Bayne, it was right. For Arminius saith, *Ratio est à duplice semine Abrahami, quorum unum tantum verbo isto & proposito comprehendatur.* And this double seed of Abraham he calls the sons of promise, whom he defines, *sunt illi qui fide in Christum justitiam & salutem querunt*, and the children of the flesh, whom he defines; *qui per opera legis justitiam, & salutem consequuntur.* (I confess it was in my copy through an easie, but not materiall oversight; consequuntur, yet in the English I render it, follow: but why this should puzzle Mr. Marshall I know not) And to this calling some Abrahams seed, who no otherwise were Abrahams seed, but in that they professing Judaisme, sought righteousness by the law, Bayne rightly opposeth that speech, that those that conceive carnally of the law seeking righteousness by it without something else adjoined, to wit naturall generation; are never called Abrahams seed. Yet Mr. Marshall in his Sermon, and again in his defence, pag. 10. calls those Abrahams seed, who are not so by naturall generation, or by faith; but are Proselytes, seeking Justification by the works of the Law: Which is the very ground of Arminius his perverting the ninth of the Romans to maintain his opinion of respective Predestination. As for Master Marshall's vindication of himselfe, it goes upon this mistake, as if

if I had charged him with agreeing with *Arminius* in the expounding the ninth to the *Romans*, and in his opinion of election upon foreseen faith, whereas I only charged him with joyning with *Arminius* in this particular, to call the Proselytes that were Jewes by profession, but sought righteousness by the law, *Abrahams* seed; pag. 105. Mr. *Marshall* layes, that I try all my wits and artifices to shake the strength of his second conclusion by scornfull speeches, &c. The truth is, I was put to the triall of all my wits to find out the meaning of his second conclusion; but as for the strength of it, it is so small, that he that can but shew the ambiguity in it, may refute it without much adoe. As for the scornfull speeches Mr. *Marshall* can find but one, which was the calling of his second conclusion, a *Cothurnus*; which I never dreamt would have been taken for an expression of scorne, but a proverbial phrase signifying an ambiguous speech used by *David Parens* in his judgement on the 5 Articles sent to the Synod of *Dort*, and by others the most grave, and solid Divines, I said, pag. 54. That Mr. *Marshall* did very carnally imagine the Church of God to be like civill corporations, this he calls pag. 121. a scornfull pufle, but why he should call it so, I am yet to seek, pag. 124. he layes, that I slight and scorn that which I know not how to answer, but it would be hard for Mr. *Marshall* to verify this in any particular; pag. 133. he calls the use of the word *Coccysme* very frequent among Schollars, and of the same meaning with *Crambe* used by Mr. *Marshall*, pag. 256. a scornfull expression; and because I say, pag. 63. of my Examen, your argument needs a swimmer of Delos to bring it out of the deep, this he calls pag. 134. my method to cast a scorn upon an argument, which is only the using a proverbial speech used by *Spanheimius* in his *dubia Evangelica*, and others concerning a thing that there is need of skill to find it out, pag. 162. 163. in answering the argument brought to prove that holiness, 1 Cor. 7. 14. is not federall Mr. *Marshall* layes. All the reply you make to it, pag. 80. is to bestow a few scoffes upon it; that my answer is to deny the conclusion, that I shew no faultiness either in the matter, or the forme of the argument, that the scope that I mention is but a meer figment; that I doe as good as say that the objectour can make no argument out of it, and that therefore I need make no answer. And that in one place I grant the minor, then the major;

An Apologie for the two Treatises

major; and thus you most gallantly vapour upon me: and after, I durst leave all Schollers to judge, whether my answer deserves all this scorne; and after, you thought to carry it with more advantage to you by scoffing, then by solemn refuting; and after. Truly Sir, I am perswaded all learned men either Laugh at, or pity this vanity of your disputing; and pag. 16+ not once suspecting I should have met with an adversary so uningenious to say no worse, who would have said the balking of this question, had been the yeelding of the cause. To all this I reply, that my words are misrecited by Mr. Marshall. I did not say, his answer is to deny the conclusion, but thus, I find no answer to the argument here, except it be an answer to an argument to deny the conclusion. Nor doe I say, that the baulking of the question, whether the beleever, when he commits fornication with an infidell, remove the barre in the unbelieveing party, as that the child is (in the believing parents right) to be reckoned to belong to the covenant of Grace, and Church of God, had been the yeelding of the Cause, which he makes my uningenuity. 2. The passages only taxe a defe&t in Logick in Mr. Marshall in that place, but doe indeed containe neither matter of scorn, nor gallant vapouring. 3. And however learned men pity or laugh at the vanity of my disputing, I doubt not to make it appeare; that neither Mr. Marshall nor Mr. Geree have yet made an answer to that argument, which doth overthrow his exposition of federall holinesse, that though Mr. Geree sayes there was ignoratio Elenchi, yet indeed there is no ignoratio Elenchi, the thing being concluded that was to be concluded; and whereas Mr. Marshall first new makes the major, and then denies it; he deales not rightly in putting in words to anothers argument, and yet the major is rather true with his addition, and then Mr. Marshall puts a minor of his owne; and denies it. But the truth is, the argument should be thus framed: That holiness which might be though one of the Parents, were not sanctified to the other, is not here meant; but federall holiness might be, though one of the Parents were not sanctified to the other. Ergo, Federall holiness is not here meant; or thus, that uncleanness which doth not agree to all the children of those whose Parents are not sanctified one in or to another, is not here meant: but federall uncleanness doth not agree to all the children of those whose Parents are not sanctified one in or to another; Ergo, Federall uncleanness is not there

bore meant. But these things I reserve till I review the dispute about the meaning of 1 Cor. 7. 14 concerning which I doubt not, but if God spare me life and liberty I shall make good my argument, and answer Mr. Marshalls exceptions, yea and further shew, that if the sanctification and holinesse be taken from the faith of one party, and not from the relation of husband and wife; the Apostles reason as they expound it, would have served to resolve two fornicatours whereof one is a beleever, the other remaining in infidelity; that they may live together as well as two married persons. pag. 10. I said, surely this is a shrowd signe that you are not likely to make good your ground, when you have yeelded so much: this he calls pag. 195. an idle scoffe, though in it there is nothing like a scoffe. pag. 113. I say. But your feithing such a compasse about, makes me imagine your attempt will prove but a parturient montes, the mountaines bring forth. This Mr Marshall calls a jeere, and a confident scoffe, and I confesse this carries the shew of a jeere, when the other part of the verse is added; but I left it out of purpose, that it might not be so taken; conceiving Mr. Marshall would have construed it (as even grave Scholars use it) to signify an attempt that is faire in shew, but vaine in the issue. pag. 122. I say of Mr. Marshall's consequence which he called undeniable and clear, thus: if you apprehend clear consequence in it, you may enjoy your conceit; nos non sumus adeo sagaces, we are not so quick mitted; this Mr. Marshall sayes, pag. 208. is to seek to render an adversary ridiculous, by jeeres and scoffes. But the truth is, that was not mine intent, but the grieve of my spirit when I wrote this, being then rejected by Mr. Marshall in the busines of the Temple, being told that it was the Assemblies rule not to nominate any to a place in the ministry that questioned the baptizing of infants, pinched with the sadness of my condition, and considering how the Magistrate was incited against such as could not subscribe to Mr. Marshall's judgement, upon his reasons which he called undeniable, an indignation that men should be undone for not assenting to so poore prooves, made me after I saw my exhortation stured not to use that quicknesse in those exprefſions; which I am periwaded, had I not done, the point would not have been examined by them to this day: p. 122. Mr Marshall sayes, your answer is a scoffe out of Horace, Amphora caput institut.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

&c. which is no scotie, but a speech often in the writings of Scholars, used to signify, that one falle short of that he should prove. pag. 164. I speak of Mr Marshall's discourse about Gods sealing conditionally to infants, & their after agnizing thus. And therefore this that you make an objection I looke on as a frivolous supposing a Chimera, and then disputing about it. This Mr Marshall calls a scotie. But what is more usuall with Schollars, then to call a fiction a Chimera, without the imputation of scotting? And these are all the supposed scoties against Mr Marshall, that I find noted by him. Now that it may appeare how unequally Mr Marshall deales with me, (that I mention no other) that most accurate and grave writer Mr Gataker in a little thing containing but 60 pages, in a full letter intituled *Antithesis*, in answer to two Protestants godly men, and as eminent as Mr Marshall; Doctor Ames an English-man Professor of Divinity at Franeker in Westfriesland, and Giobert Voetius Professoar of Vrechte, about Lusvrytors. hath these passages, pag. 6. *Sibylla qd fertur folium: sed qd nisi sibylla nobis explicuerit: interpretaturum alium credo autore dempro neminem*, pag. 16. *cum absurditas illius detecta plene jam fuerit & revera defensib[us] suis, nihil puto ipsam*, pag. 17. *quam involuunt a tandem ista &c, de sensu si ambigimus, condonabit nobis spero, Amesimus; neque enim hebetioris paulo ingenii qd sumus ista facile assigimur*, pag. 20. *verum ista prout & superiora plura quo tanta qd id est vix, pag. 21. nam qd sequuntur mibi enigmata sunt mera, & Sphingo vel Oedipo opus habent*, pag. 22. *nam qd sequuntur non sunt novici, pag. 22. neq[ue] enim perspicue loqi amas Amesimus; sed anguillante in morem ambigua locutionis cano sua involvere & occultare solent habet*, pag. 24. *nam in testimonio illius, qd plurimum in hac causa, ponderis obtinet interpretatione, meras agni præstigia; eaque proponit, qd sibi invicem aduersantur, &c.* pag. 27. *verum præsumitur ista qd ex his posuisse rationem profundum, sunt ab omni sensu humana profusa aliena. Ita levior reprehenditur ratinacula ista, qd pro argumento ratione Achilleo ac palmario proponitur, qd sum ipso farfari folia, pag. 31. qd imbelle arctimbe plante argenteum, & viro tanto profusa indignum. Ecquis tam voces mihi idemntas i pag. 32. qd tenorem vultus mutantem Procul modo, pag. 33. vanitas illis potius incusat Amesimus, qd rara vana vobis aggressum, seque etiam qd adversari istud obiecta non*

qam adversus illud opposita proponit ; tum consecutionibus & suo
cerebro confitis elidendis negotiis sibi frustra facessit, pag. 34.
cum aliorum, tum & Amosis etiam ipsius dogma futile, pag. 46.
quarum ille qasdam tanquam cramben roties recollam reponit,
pag. 48 affirmatur non probatur, quasi Pythagoricum illud esse ipsa.
sufficeret. Which passages as I conceive no man ever charged with
scolding to neither doe I conceive justly might mine, which shew
no more sleighting or contempt of my opponents then his doe.

But pag. 94. of my Examen I say, the misunderstanding of Co-
lo. 1. 11. 12. hath been the Ignis fatuus, foolish fire, which h. th-
led men out of the way in this matter into bogs. Upon this Mr Mar-
shall pag. 179.. thus speaks to me. Truly sir, were these scorns of
being led by foolish fire into bogs &c. cast upon my selfe only, it were
nothing; but when they are thus cast in the faces of all Divines, an-
cient and modern; all Harmonies and Confessions (except onely a
handfull of upstart Anabaptists, as if they were all such simple ones
that ignis fatuus, a foolish fire might lead them into any bog; I can
hardly forbear to tell you : it is an argument of an arrogant spirit.

I pity Mr Marshall's distemper, that occasioned this passage,
to speak of casting scornes in the faces of all Divines ancient and
modern, as if all Divines did expound that text, in that misunder-
stood way I mention ; to talke of all Harmonies and Confessions,
instead of the Harmony of confessions, which containes not many;
and one I am sure it is not against, to wit the English confession :
to speak ditdainfully of them that are his opponents under the
term of upstart Anabaptists, to make the using of the term *ignis
fatuus*, to resemble a milunderstanding, a scoufe ; to impute it to
me as if I had acculed all Divines ancient and modern, all Harmonies
and Confessions of simplicity, as if a milunderstanding might
not be in all men out of common infirmity, to impute it to
me as if I had said into any bog, whereas I said, *hath led men out
of the way in this matter into bogs*, meaning the opinions; that Bap-
tisme succeeds into the place, room, and use of Circumcisio : and
therefore that the command to circumcise male infants at the
eighth day, is a command to baptize any infants of believers at any
time; which errors I call bogs, as being indeed Anti-evangel-
call errors : though all the Divines on earth should mouche
them, yet this I may say without arrogancy of Spirit, in just and
necessary

An Apologie for the two Treatises

26

&c. which is no scoffe, but a speech often in the writings of Scholars, used to signify, that one fals short of that he should prove. pag. 164. I speak of Mr Marhsalls discourse about Gods healing conditionally to infants, & their after agnizing thus. And therefore this that you make an objection I looke on as a frivolous supposing a Chimæra, and then disputing about it. This Mr Marhsalls calls a scoffe. But what is more usuall with Schollars, then to call a fiction a Chimæra, without the imputation of scoffing? And these are all the supposed scoffes against Mr Marshall, that I find noted by him. Now that it may appeare how unequally Mr Marshall deales with me, (that I mention no other) that most accurate and grave writer Mr Gataker in a little thing containing but 60 pages, in a full letter intituled *Antithesis*, in answer to two Protestants godly men, and as eminent as Mr Marshall; Doctor Ames an English-man Professor of Divinity at Franeker in Westfriesland, and Gisbert Voetius Professour of Virecht, about Lusorylors: hath these passages, pag. 6. *Sibylle qod fertur folium : sed qod nisi sibylla nobis explicuerit :interpretaturum alium credo autore dempto neminem*, pag. 16. *cum absurditas illius detecta plane jam fuerit & revera defensoribus suis* *videtur ut non ipsorum*, pag. 17. *quam involuta tandem ista i &c, de sensu si ambigimus, condonabit nobis spero, Amesius ; neque enim hebetioris paulo ingenii qd sumus ista facile asseqimur*, pag. 20. *verum ista prout & superiora pleraque inula qd idis vixit*, pag. 21. *nam qd sequuntur mhi enigmata sunt mera, & Sphingo vel Oedipo opus habent*, pag. 22. *nam qd sequuntur non sunt nauci*, pag. 22. *neq; enim perspicue logi amat Amesius ; sed anguillarum in morem ambigua locutionis ceno sua involvere & occultare solenne habet*, pag. 24. *nam in testimonio illius, qd plurimum in hac causa, ponderis obtinet interpretatione, meras agis prastigias ; eage proponis, qd sibi invicem adversantur, &c.* pag. 27. *verum pronuntiata ista qd ex hic positi tamen profluunt, sunt ab omni sensu humano prorsus aliena. Ita levior deprehenditur ratiuncula ista, qd pro arguento tamen Achillao ac palmario proponitur, qd sunt ipsa farfari folia*, pag. 31. *qd imbelli argumentum, & viro tanto prorsus indignum. Ecquis tam vecors us ista admittat?* pag. 32. *qd teneam vultus mutarem Proteam modo*, pag. 33. *vanitatis illos potius incusat Amesius, qd tamen vana nobis oggeserunt, seque etiam qd adversus istud objecta tan-*

gam

Iam adversus illud opposita proponit ; tum consecutionibus è suo cerebro confutis elidendis negotium sibi frustra facevit, pag. 34. cum aliorum, tum & Amesii etiam ipsum dogma futile, pag. 46. quarum ille qasdam rancam cramben roties recollam reponit, pag. 48. affirmatur non probatur, quasi Pythagoricum illud auct. ior. sufficeret. Which passages as I conceive no men ever charged with scoffing to neither doe I conceive justly might mine, which shew no more sleighting or contempt of my opponents then his doe.

But pag. 94. of my Examen I say, *the misunderstanding of Col. 2. 11. 12. hath been the Ignis fatuus, foolish fire, which hath led men out of the way in this matter into bogs.* Upon this Mr Marshall pag. 179.. thus speaks to me. Truly sir, were these scorns of being led by foolish fire into bogs &c. cast upon my selfe only, it were nothing; but when they are thus cast in the faces of all Divines, ancient and modern; all Harmonies and Confessions (except onely a handfull of upstart Anabaptists) as if they were all such simple ones that an ignis fatuus, a fools fire might lead them into any bogs; I can hardly forbear to tell you : it is an argument of an arrogant spirit.

I pity Mr Marshall's distemper, that occasioned this passage, to speak of casting scorns in the faces of all Divines ancient and modern, as it all Divines did expound that text, in that misunderstood way I mention; to talke of all Harmonies and Confessions, instead of the Harmony of confessions, which containes not many; and one I am sure it is not against, to wit the English confession: to speak ditdainfully of them that are his opponents under the term of upstart Anabaptists, to make the using of the term *ignis fatuus*, to resemble a misunderstanding a scoffe; to impute it to me as if I had accused all Divines ancient and modern, all Harmonies and Confessions of simplicity; as if a misunderstanding might not be in all men out of common infirmity, to impute it to me as if I had said into any bogs, whereas I said, *hath led men out of the way in this matter into bogs* meaning the opinions; that Baptisme succeeds into the place, room, and use of Circumcision: and therefore that the command to circumcise male infants at the eighth day, is a command to baptize any infants of believers at any time; which errors I call bogs, as being indeed Anti-evangelical errors: though all the Divines on earth should avouch them, yet this I may say without arrogance of Spirit, in just and

An Apologie for the two Treatises

necessary avouching of the truth. That reverend and learned Divine Mr Gataker in his answer to Mr George Walkers vindication, pag. 133. Sayesthus. Howsover I suppose it no such bainous matter in something to depart from all writers knowne to us, that have gone before us. Sure I am that Junius and Tremellius in translating and expounding some passages of Scripture, departed from all known Interpreters that had gone before them, as in that place, Mal. 2. 16. that in all, even the best transtations ever before ran; if thou hate her, put her away. Pareus Comment: in 1 Cor. 1. 12. *miror vero hoc loco omnes ferè interpretes fictionem statuere.* I might fill a volume with interpretations different from all foregoing; yea, what interpreter of note is there who doth not differ from all others, and yet it is not counted arrogancy? Besides, if this be not allowed upon cogent reason, how shall Scriptures and Truths be cleared? How shall we avoyd idolizing of them that goe before us, and subjecting our judgments to them? And that I speake right, it may appeare in that, in the principall thing of my exposition of Colos. 2. 11. 12. to wit, that Baptisme is mentioned not to shew that it succeeds Circumcision, but because it is one of the means whereby we have communion with Christ, and are compleat in him, and therefore Faith is joyned with Baptisme, and alleged to prove it; Gal. 3. 25, 26, 27. (not as in Mr Marshall's defence, Gal. 5. 25, 26.) and Rom. 6. 3, 4, 5, which plainly shewes that here Baptisme is not mentioned to that end. Mr Marshall expresseth, & upon which the misunderstanding of this place was occasioned, but to another; and therefore it proves not that which Mr Marshall would gather from it; if it did, it would prove that faith succeeds into the roome place, and use of Circumcision as well as Baptisme. To this Mr Marshall plainly sayes, But is not this the same sense with mine. But he after spends a great many words to no purpose (as he is wont to doe when he mistakes my reason) imagining I had reasoned thus. Baptisme is named as one of the meanes whereby we come to be compleat in Christ, therefore it doth not succeed in the room of circumcision, whereas my reason is thus. Baptisme is alleged as one of the meanes whereby we come to be compleat in Christ, therefore there was another reason besides the succession of it into the place of Circumcision, why the Apostle there mentions it, which Mr Marshall denied; which reason is good, except

Of the exposition I give of
Colos. 2. 12.
Confessed to
be right by
Mr Marshall
himselfe.

except it were untrue, that every meanes whereby we are compleat in Christ, succeeds Circumcision, the contrary whereof is confessed by Mr Marshall in acknowledging faith to bee one of the meanes whereby we are compleat in Christ, which yet succeeds not Circumcision: many more such mistakes in Doctor Homes, Mr Geree, and Mr Marshall, I may hereafter shew; I thought it best however God deale with me to cleare my selfe in this, and to take notice of this concession, which with others I may improve to overthrow all Mr Marshall's dilpote. But it is arrogance to deny that which all reformed Churches teach, that our Baptisme succeeds into the place, roome, and use of the Jewes Circumcision.

To this Answer: 1. I know not that all the reformed Churches teach this, I remember not where this Doctrine is determined in the Church of Englands publique Doctrinals. 2. Master Garaker in his Postscript to Master Wottons Defence, saith thus; That justification consisteth in remission of sins, for my part I deeme erroneous, and suppose that elsewhere I have evidently shewed it to be; Howbeit Calvin, Beza, Olevius, Ursinus, Zanchius, Piscator, Parens, Musculus, Bullinger, Eoz, and divers others of great note, and name, yea whole Synods of ours are found so to say, and yet I never heard this charged for arrogancy on him. And for the assertions I impugne, that Baptisme comes in the place, roome, and use of Circumcision, and that this may be proved from Colos. 2. 11, 12. though Master Marshall hold his rod over me, saying, I can hardly forbear to tell you it is an argument of an arrogant spirit, I feare not yet to call them an ignis fatuus, that leadeth man out of the way in this matter into boggs. To conclude my answer to this charge of scoffing, I do the lesse marvaile that it is my lot to be thus charged, when Mr Geree in his vindicatio pedobaptismi, Pag. 66, 67. calls one free speech very necessary of Master Ralph Cudworth a man so approved, as by Ordinance of Parliament constituted Master of a Houle in Cambridge, a quipping passage carrying an impression of a satyricall spirit against our reverend Divines, to be abhored, not countenanced. And I say further that if my memory do not deceive me, there are passages in Smectymnuus, that carry as much shew of irony as mine do, towards a man for age, and learning not inferiour to Master Marshall, and therefore I suppose my words, which are usuall among Scholars, might have had a more favourable construction. I am bold to

An Apologie for the two Treatises

30

make use of Master Gatakers words to *Lucius*, Part. ult. Sect. 8, Pag, 91. *Stomacho nimium quod indulget vir Cl: superciliosusque nimis alie attollit, qui tam ager fert placita sua circa nullam vel censoria magistratutis, vel censura magistralis volam aut vestigium eis formulis qibus apud scholis disceptantes nihil est usuratum negari, sedq; cum negationis rationes adiectas aut videt aut videre si velut queat.* Neverthelesse I professe freely, that had I dreamed such expressions so usuall in Scholastick disputes would have been so taken, I would for avoyding of offence have abstained from them.

§. 6.

Of the clearing the Author of the Examen from either justifying the Anabaptists in Germany, or condemning the godly, and grave Non-conformists in England.

There is another charge against me that sticks deeper then the former, and it is this : Master Marshall in his Sermon had mentioned the *Anabaptists as a dangerous and turbulent sect, working a world of mischiefe about Munster, and other parts of Germany*. This relation I conceived to be used, not only to Magistrates to make them wary to prevent the like, bnt also in all sorts of Auditories, with much ingemination to make the persons that question the baptizing of Infants odious, and unsufferable in a Christian Commonwealth, and to stop mens eares against such evidence as may cleare the truth in this matter. To this therefore, as being an objection in the mouth of all sorts of men against the Antipædo-baptists, I thought it best to answer : 1. By granting much of the relation to be true, though perhaps vehemency of opposition hath made matters more, or worse then they were, as it is wont to be in such cases. To this Master Marshall saies, that he is confident I shew more good will to the *Anabaptists*, then intend ill will against those worthy men who have written those stories. I do take with the right hand this charitable opinion in Master Marshall of my intentions, and I plainly reply, that the truth is, that I did use those words, neither out of partiall good will to the one, nor partiall ill will to the other, but out of a desire to remove that prejudice, which hindered men from examining the Truth. As for the men I abhorre the wicked practises of the one, yea so much the more I abhorre he practises of them that would to solemnly by baptismal engage themselves to be Christ Disciples, and yet act such monstrous villanies, as having learned that the more profession a man makes of holiness, the more accursed is his wickednesse ; and for the other, I beare as much good will to the memory of them, as if they had agreed with me in opinion. I hope I shall

shall never make agreement with me in opinion, the reason or rule of my love, but relation to Jesus Christ, appearing in holiness of life. Master Marshall saies, that the things are not to be questioned, and that he thinks that I am the first of our Divines who have suspected them to overlash in their relations. To this I say, my words are plaine, that much of this is true I make no question, meaning the maine of the relations, that the men denied baptizing of Infants, and that they brake out into such turbulent practices as are related of them. That which I added though perhaps vehemency of opposition hath made matters more, or wbrse then they were, as it is wont to be in such cases, meaning this, of some particular circumstances in some persons, was not because I suspected the overlashing of the Historians, as if they wanted fidelity, but because many things were brought to the publike knowledge by the Bishop and Canons of Munster, their partisans who were Papists, and would aggravate all things to the most to make the *Lutheran Reformation* become odious; as *Sindley* did in the accident of *Enoch ap Evan* killing his mother and brother, or else by captives or desertors, who for favour or mercy would frame their tales, as they conceived might further their ends, and because experience of the uncertainty of the manner of carrying things in our times, hath made me speake warily concerning things past. And to speake plainly, when I consider what *Hooker* relates out of *Guy de Bres* of the seeming holynesse of the generality of them, their Orthodox confession at first mentioned by Master Marshall from Master *Dury* his knowledge, the proceedings and parts of *Bernardus Rotmannus* and some others, the things mentioned by my Examen, Part, 2. Sect, 3. the testimonies of *Gualter*, and *Cassander*, that the commotions in *Germany* began from oppression in the State, that *Luther* wrot to the Germane Princes against their oppressions, the strange spirit of *Lutherans* ever since, and the wofull tragedies of *Germany* in this last age, I do count the story of the Anabaptists to containe in it many things, the true reasons of which, and the true knowledge of the circumstances concerning them will not appeare till the day of the revelation of the righteous judgement of God. 2. I assigned some possible meanes of the turbulent carriages, and errors of the Anabaptists, beside their opinion of Anti-pædobaptisme. To which Master Marshall saies, he can hardly guesse.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

guesse whether I intended to excuse the Anabaptists in part, or to blame the Reformed Churches for not bearing them, or to hint it as a warning to our selves. I answer, I did it to shew there might be other reasons of those tumults and divisions that the Anabaptists fell into, then the opinion of Antipædobaptisme; sundry of which, if not all I think happened in their case. Master Marshall saies, he never read that they sought Reformation in a regular way, or were denied it, before they fell into those furies. How farre they fought it I cannot tell, it is plaine that Caroloftadius and Pelargus, and some say Melanthon would have reformed it in Saxony, had not Luthers pertinacy in that as well as Consubstantiation, and Images withstood it; and how Baltazar Huebmer sought it at Zurich, and was denied, it is known. I thinke the Reformed Churches have been to blame, and so may be our present Reformers, that they have never yeelded to reforme it in a regular way; and if Anabaptists have never sought it afore me, it hath been it's likely, because they law mens spirits to bent against them, that they thought it in vaine, yea they have beeene rather forced to conceale themselves, it having beeene accounted criminall, justly deserving excommunication, deprivation, and sometimes death, so much as to question it. And that the Anabaptists have been so cast out and rendered odious as they have been hath been the reason why they have been forced to become a Sect (which I do not jultifie) and by reason thereof, factious spirits have joyned with them, and perverted them with other errors, which perhaps had not happened, had they been more tenderly and considerately handled at first.

3. I said, but have not the like, if not the same things happened in other matters? Did not the like troubles happen in Queen Elizabeths daies, in seeking to remove Episcopacy and Ceremonies? To this Master Marshall saith, The rest of that Section, is to me exireamely scandalous, when I read your odious comparisons between the Non-conformists in Queene Elizabeths daies, and the Anabaptists in Germany; it even grieues me to consider, whether affection to your cause doth carry yass. And Master Gresse not only Pag. 70. of his *Vindicatione* pædobaptismi, wonders at me that I should compare the troubles of the Non-conformists, and the Anabaptists, and marvels such an uncharitable and unjust thought should arise in me, that divisions or other miscarriages of the Non-conformists should

should bring them low in England: And beside all this, Master Gere publisheth a single sheet in print, and it came to my knowledge first by one that carried it about with other news Books, and this Paper he styles *the Character of an old Puritan or Non-conformist*, and in the end saith thus: Reader seeing a passage in Master Tombes his book against P^t do^t baptism, wherein he compares the Non-conformists in England, to the Anabaptists in Germany, in regard of their miscarriages and ill successe in their endeavour still of late yeares, I was moved for the vindication of those faithfull, and reverend witnesses of Christ, to publish this character. In which Mr Gere plainly intinuates, that I accused those faithfull witness^{es} of Christ, whom he calls elsewhere the grave, godly, learned and unblameable Non-conformists in England. To answere this objection, I say that I never had a thought by thole words Did not divisions and other miscarriages and persecutions, bring the Non-conformists of England as low as the Anabaptists in Germany? To accuse thole men he names of such miscarriages. I honour the memory of Cartwright, Brightman, Hilderham, Parker, Dod, Bradshaw, and the rest of the same stamp as godly, learned, unblameable and faithfull servants of Christ. But I said some there were that in seeking to remove Episcopacy and ceremonies did by their divisions, meaning those of Browne, Barrow, and others, and other miscarriages, meaning of the writers of the Books called *Martin Marprelate*, and the like, the miscarriages of Hacker and his companions, the Prelates taking hold thereof to accuse them as seditious, and to incense the Queen and State against them with persecution bring them as low as the Anabaptists in Germany. And I said that the like if not the same troubles happened here in England as in Germany, meaning not in the degree, but in the kind, not in the fruit, but in the seed, which if the prudence of the State here had not timely prevented, (which could not be so well done in Germany, by reason of so many petty free States) might have broken out into as great a flame as thole combustions in Germany. In which my intent was not to discredit Bullinger, Stedan, Calvin, &c. nor to justify in the least manner the Anabaptists wicked practices, but only to shew that in seeking to reforme an abuse, there may happen such miscarriages and divisions, by the Devils stirring up some factious and hypocriticall spirits of thole that joyne with the

An Apologie for the two Treatises

34

seekers of Reformation, to breake our into hainous enormities of purpose to stop mens mouthes from speaking for, and mens eares from hearing of Truth. And therefore all that love the Truth, though they have reason to suppress those turbulent spirits, and take heed of mens heady advites though for a good end, yet they should not yeeld to the Devil so much as to permit him by the clamours against those factious spirits, to cheat them of the Truth, or to make them lesse, but rather more zealous for it. And that this was my meaning, had my words been either well heeded, or candidly construed, might have been perceived by them. Here I wish Master *Gere* to consider whether it were agreeable to that friendship he acknowledgeth to have been between us, without any violating of it on my part, to publish such an unjust charge against me, and so to lay more burdens on my backe, after I told him he had not dealt kindly nor rightly with me in his Epistle Dedicatory to a Peere of the Realme in aspersing me, whereby I might suffer much and never be heard speak for my self, & yet never once aske me, though he had twice conference with me, once a little before his Book was published, the other, the same day it was put forth, whom I meant in those passages. I may well take up that speech of *Abel* to *Hushai*, *Is this thy kindness to thy friend?* Now from that which hath been laid, it will be easie to answere Master *Marshall's* Queries. The *Anabaptists* in Germany rose up, and with fire and sword pulled down Magistracy, Schooles, &c. did she like, if not the same things happen here? Tis true the Bores or Country people over all Germany did such things, and among them were those that they called *Anabaptists*, but these things were done by others then *Anabaptists*, and in some places where it doth not appear to me that any such were: the cause of which was pretended the oppressions of the people by the Princes, but in Truth their desire to plunder and spoyle. Now though the lechers of the removall of Episcopacy, and Ceremonies, did not the same things in degree, yet they did such seditious things as were of the same kind, and tended to them, as inciting against the Magistrates; such invectives against Schooles, as had they not been Wirkwood, might have produced the same effects, of which you may see passages out of *Baynes* in Master *Baynes* *Dissertation*, Chap. 2. And I pray God we never finde by experience, that disconected Presbyterians

terians can act the like things for their Presbytery, that Anabaptists did for their Anabaptism. Mr Marshall saith, what did the Non-conformists ever endeavour to do beyond prayers and soares? If M. Marshall mean by non-conformists such as M. Geree describes in his Character, I have nothing to accuse them, but if he mean by Non-conformists those that fought to remove Episcopacy and Ceremonies, which was my phratre, knowing that in processe of time the terme Non-conformists was contradistinguished to Separatists) some of them used railing against men in place & authority, witnesse the Libels of Martin Marprelate, and such like in too great abundance, some of them, if Camden relate true in his *Annals of Elizabeth ad Annum 1591.* either conspired with, or some way animated Hacket, upon conceite that he was an extraordinary person raised by God to bring in the Discipline. Master Marshall saies what turbulent Sect was ever among them, my words were, Did not some of them that fought to remove Episcopacy and Ceremonies, grow a dangerous and turbulent Sect? Which words of mine are true in the followers of Browne, Barrow, &c. whom I thinke Mr Marshall will not deny to have been a dangerous and turbulent Sect, and they were at first a part of them that sought to remove Episcopacy and Ceremonies. He askes, what were those divisions and miscarriages which brought them so low? I had said, Did not divisions and other miscarriages and persecutions bring the Non-conformists of England as low as the Anabaptists? The divisions I meant, were those that were between the Separatists and other Non-conformists, the miscarriages I meant, were those of Martin Marprelate, Barrow, Hacket, and others which did incite Queene Elizabeth and the State against them, to arme the Bishops with their power, by which they did persecute them. Dr John Burges rejoyned, Chap. 2. Sect. 11. Pag. 5. For my part I thinke that the violence of some meaner men against those things, hath caused the sharper execution of Lawes against some other men of worth. Crudelem medicum intemperans ager facit. Master Marshall toucheth the story of Hacket and his companions and then saith: But what is this to your purpose? what had Hacket to do with the Non-conformists, who you know (if ever you read the story) abominated him, and would have nothing to do with him even before he fell into those prankes he plaide in London? I answer, I have read the story of Hacket in Cardens *Annals of Queen*

An Apologie for the two Treatises

*Queen Elizabeth ad annum 1591. in Saravia against Beza de diversis ministrorum grauisbus, in Srow and Howe, and I do not find by these that the seekers to remove Episcopacy did abominate him as you say, but that Wigginton a Minister, and others of that party did either conspire with him, or otherwise encourage him upon the hope they had, that by him the Discipline should be promoted, and I find many practises like those of John of Leyden at Munster, as the pretending of revelations, affecting anointing as a King, commanding his Prophets Arthington and Coppinger to go into the City and preach, exciting the people against the Archbishop and Lord Chancellour, yea I find Hacke's end to have been worse in a more horrible manner than that of John of Leyden: nor do I doubt had London been in the same state as Munster was, but the Tragedy would have been as bad in the seeking to remove Episcopacy and Ceremonies, as it was in seeking to remove Pædobaptisme. And if the Non-conformists did abominate Hacke, so did the Anabaptists that followed Mennon, the Munster, and Basenburgick furies. And as for the parallel I brought out of Whitgift and Hooker, I did it not to justifie their charges against the Non-conformists, but to shew that they deprehended a likenesse of spirit & waies in some of the one, as well as the other. And my end in the whole was to shew, that in seeking to remove a reall error, and abuse, famous persons may fall into such miscarriages, and yet their miscarriages ought not to hinder the Reformation of the error or abuse, though these things may well be urged for caveats to Magistrates and people, to suppress & take heed of the seditious practises of such agents: which warning being rightly taken, is good and necessary, yea perhaps more necessary for these times then I at first imagined, and so needs not a *det. a nr.* but a right construction.*

S. 7. Another charge Master Ley, and Master Marshall fasten upon me that I wrote my Treatises as a braving Goliah, so Master Ley, *ubi supra*: Master Marshall in his Defence, Pag. 2. And come into the field so bravely and giantlike. Pag. 2 + 4. Truly Sir, this smels a little too rankely, thus confidently to challenge all men, not contented with Goliah to say, give me a man that I may fight with him, but to defie a whole host, argues a little too much selfe confidence: To which Ianswer if Master Ley, or Master Marshall either had allowed me so charitable an opinion, as my forepast life and actions might have induced

induced them to have of me, or heeded my words in the prologue and Epilogue in my *Examen*, they would never have fastned this charge of a braving Goliah, or confident challenging or defying a whole host on me. For my bygone actions, they rather speake me a man willing to gratifie others, and to serve the common good, then to make ostentation of my selfe out of selfe confidence. There are many that can make report of my labours in the places where God hath disposed of me, there are none that can give one instance, wherein I have put my selfe forward to shew my parts either in Preaching the publike Sermons in the University, or at *Pauls*, or in great meetings in the Countrey, or before great men, or the Parliament, or the Armies, but what ever I have done upon any such occasions, necessity or conscience have induced me to it. And for my writings such as they are, setting aside the *Examen* and *Exercitation*, they carry their plea for them in their forehead. Infirmities I have, and those many, but sure the whole course of my actions are a plea for me against this imputation of a braving, challenging, vaunting humour: yea did not the mindfulnesse of my account to God, love to the soules of men, and the discharge of my duty, lead me into publike actions, I should rather embrace that advise, *bene quis latuit, bene vixit.* Certainly in this busynesse, I was to farre from the braving humour, that, as may be perceived by the relation above, necessity engaged me to it, not selfe confidence, and an humour of ostentation. The truth is, there were other arguments that I had entered upon, before I was engaged in this matter, as namely against the mortality of the soule, universal grace, the Antinomian errors abour justification, and justifying faith, and some since, as about the matter and forme of a particular visible Church, about the nature of Schisme and Heresie, in which I might safely have exercised such abilities as I have, if selfe ostentation had been my motive, and not have put my finger in this fire, durst I desert the Truth. But how uncharitably Master *Ley*, and Master *Marshall* do construe my action, I thinke it will presently appeare to him that shall read the Prologue, and Epilogue of my *Examen*, especially those speeches, wherein I declared my intentions to be either to rectifie Master Marshall, or to be rectified by him, that we might give one another the right hand of fellowship, and I pray that the Lord would vouchsafe to frame our spirits to seeke the

An Apologie for the two Treatises

truth in humilitie and love, which might have given them cause to have conceived otherwise of my disposition, then they have done, except they judged my speech hypocritical, which I am sure would have been beyond their line to do. In the Epilogne I tell Master Marshall, that I examined his Sermon in the middest of many wants, distractions, discouragemens, and temptations, which were indeed very many, so many that nothing but Gods assistance, and the thought of my account to God could, as then the case was with me, have carried me thorough the worke. I said that I knew no reason, why Master Marshall should conceive, that I had taken the paines to examine his Sermon for any ends crosse to the finding of Truth, I tell him plainly, my reall intention in this worke is to discover Truth, and to do what is meet for me in my calling, towards the Reformation of these Chanches, according to Gods word, unto which we have both bound our selves by solemn Covenants. These words should have acquitted me from this charge of braving out of selfe confidence, if Master Marshall, or Master Ley knew nothing to the contrary, as I am sure they did not, and I thinke they have no prospective glasse to look into my brest. And for the words Mr Marshall saies, *smell a turtle too rankely of challenging and dysfying a whole Host,* had he considered or recited the whole period, and not cut off my words in the middest, he had seen that my words were not a braving challenge, but a faire and most reasonable motion, to have some one Treatise framed by those that had appeared in publike, and whose writings or Sermons, I had endeayoured to answer, that I might know what they would stand to, and save my selfe the labour and charge of buying and reading every indigested Pamphlet: And after I made another motion, in case this was not liked, to have a meeting to consult about a way of brotherly and peaceable ventilating this point. The rejecting of both these motions by Master Marshall if they make him not inexcusable, yet I presume make my proceedings excusable, and his so palpable a misconstruction of my spirit in this matter, doth strongly argue that he looked on my writing with a bloudshot eye, however he protest the contrary in his Epistic Dedicatory to the Assembly. And I think he should not shooe very wide from the marke, that should imagine that these exceptions against the Author, are for want of a cleare answer to the Booke.

There is yet another charge against me that flies higher, and comes nearer to the matter, if it were true, and it is indeed (though they do not call it so) the deceit of Sophistry in my writing, which if it were so, were a damnable sin to pervert the Truth of God by such prophane handling. But let us consider what is said: Master Marshall Pag. 2. of his Defence, saith thus: *wherem I shall not (as you have done) carpe at every phrase or expression, nor digresse into importinent discourses, thereby to swell up a volume, nor amuse the Reader with multitudes of quotations of Latin and Greeke Authors, and then turne them into English; nor frame as many sensess of an expression as is possible, and then confuse them, and so fight with men of straw, of mine own setting up: nor spend a whole sheet of paper together, in confuring what was never intended by my adversary, as the Reader shall clearly perceive you have dealt with me.*

In answer hereto, I say: The first charge is to ranke, that unlesse he meane by carping something else then I conceive, to wit a wanton, unnecessary, quarrelling, or excepting without cause, it is so palpable an untruth, that I wonder he would let it fall from his pen, unlesse he wrote at adventure. I do sometimes (and yet not so frequently as there was occasion) declare the ambiguity and unfitnessse of some expressions; but never without reason, out of a carping humour: *multillesse carpe at every phrase or expression.* And for the second, it is true, I do make some digressions, and so did Doctor John White in his way to the true Church, Doctor Twisse in his vindicacion against Arminius, but these digressions I am sure are all most pertinent, and necessary to a full discussion of the argument in hand, *not to swell up a volume,* but to cleare the truth. The third charge is as vaine, for the quotations are not multitudes, how so many as that praise-worthy writer Master Gataker meth few of them unncessary, nor for abusing the Reader but for confirmation of my intent, and the turning them into English I should thinke was no fault, unlesse he could have proved I either misquoted or mistranslated, Whitch I thinke in any thing of weight he cannot do. Yet I acknowledge that in my Examen, Part. 1. Sec. 8. Pag. 9. I did say *Petrus de Bryus did appale to the Greeke Church, thinking the words [being himself a Latine, ignorant of Greeke] had been spoken of Petrus de Bryus, but it seemes Petrus Cluniacensis speaks*

Of the clearing the Author of the two Treatises from Sophistry in them, whereby occasion is taken to vindicate the Treatises in many of the chiefe things contained in them.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

speakes it of himselfe, and I there through mistake of memory put [Arles] for [Orange] a City neare it. And these I thanke Doctor *Homes* for advertising me of: and shall be willing to confess any other oversights, that no reader may be deceived by me: though for the present I know no other. Doctor *Homes* names some other, yet I conceive wrongfully. As for the framing of as many senses of an expression as is possible, and then confuting them, this I thought had been a vertue in disputing to find out the many sensess of an expression, and to confute them. I ever tooke this good arguing; if the conclusion be true, then in this or that sense, but in none of all these it is true, ergo it is not true: and that this had not been fighting with men of straw, but fighting with the strongest enemy that was in the field.

S. 9.
Of the meaning of Master Marshall's second conclusion, the words in the *D* *r*e*d*e*s*t*y*. [*the promise is made to Believers and their seed*] and the Doctrine therein delivered, disavowed by Mr Marshall and Mr. Geree.

The last charge is, that I spend a whole sheet of paper in confuting what was never intended by him: be it so; yet if the Reader were likely to take it so, it was fit it should be refuted, and himselfe blamed for speaking no plainer, but leading his Reader and Answerer out of the way, by the ambiguity of his expression. But to examine this charge more fully: He meanes I assure my selfe the refuting of this conclusion Exam. Part. 3. Sect. 4. from Pag. 48. to 54 (which comes short of a whole sheet) That the Covenant of saving grace in Christ expressed in Gen. 7.7. in these words [I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed] is made to Believers and their naturall seede. This saith Master Marshall Pag. 116. of his Defence was never asserted by him. For my part, though I conceived still that Master Marshall would never stand to this assertion, and I acknowledged in expresse termes, that sometimes Master Marshall spake mort warily, yet I gave many reasons why in his second conclusion his words were to be so taken, as if he had asserted that, which Master Marshall neither hath, nor I thinke can clearly take off, nor did I herein fasten any thing upon him against my own light, as he seemeth to suspect, Pag. 116. of his Defence, and Master Geree Pag. 13. of his *Vindicta paedobaptistis*. For the passage he brings out of my Book is not contradictory, sith I might suppose he held not all the Infants of Believers to be actually regenerate, and yet might suppose he held that the Covenant of Saving Grace was made to them all, sith all the Elect persons have the Covenant made to them as the Apostle supposeth, Rom. 9.8. and yet are not actually regenerated.

regenerate. Besides Master *Marshall* in his answer to the fourth and fifth objection, speaks as if he held the Covenant of Grace conditionall, and so might hold that all the children of Beleevers have the Covenant of saving Grace made to them conditionally, though not absolutely. I will adde what Doctor *Homes* Pag. 113. of his *Animadversions* tells me. Master T. knew learned Master P. (I thinke he meanes Master *William Pemble* of *Magdalen Hall* in *Oxford*, a famous worthy writer, whose memory is very pretious to me, in whose time Doctor *Homes*, Master *Gere* and my selfe, lived together in that house to the benefit of us all) who would say, can any meere man write much, and not in anything contradict himselfe? Why then should it be thought strange that I should conceive Master *Marshall* would contradict that in one place, which he had avouched elsewhere, especially sith I find it frequent for Protestant Divines in this very thing, to unsay in dispute against *Arminians* about perseverance, what they avow in dispute against *Anabaptists*: sure I am Master *Cottons* words which I examine in a digression, meane plainly the Covenant of saving Grace, and theretore he interprets *Gen.* 17. 7. of the Covenant of saving Grace, and Master *Philips*, that the Covenant is made to them because offered, and Master *Thomas Goodwin* in his Lectures about Infant-baptisme, meant it of the Covenant of saving Grace and therefore limited it so, as that for the most part Election did run through the loynes of Beleevers, and Master *Herle* at Bow-Church for Master *Goodwin* on *Heb.* 8. 10. tooke upon him to refute Anabaptists from thence, because the Covenant there was made with the house of Judah, and *Gal.* 3. 14, the blessing of Abraham was to come upon the Gentiles, and that was the Covenant of saving Grace. And for my part, I know not how to construe those words of the Directory, That the promise is made to Beleevers and their seed, any otherwise then of the promise of saving Grace, which I conceived plaine by the expression following, make this baptisme to the Infant a seale of adoption, remission of sins, regeneration and eternall life, and of all other promises of the Covenant of Grace. The Directory doth in my apprehension plainly appoint the begging for the child the accomplishment of the promise before asserted to Beleevers and their seed, and therefore as in the petition it is meant of saving Graces, so in the assertion, or else the words are to am-

An Apologie for the two Treatises

42

biguous, as they may be a *Cathurnus*, which were more fit for a Canon of the Council of Trent, then for the Directory of a Protestant Church. Besides the same promise is said to be made to Believers seed, which is made to Believers, but that they will not deny to be meant of the promise of saving Grace, therefore neither the other. To this Master Marshall Pag. 116, 117. of his Defence answers thus : 1. He leaves out the words which were for my purpose [and of all other promises of the Covenant of Grace] which is not right dealing : 2. He makes me to conclude from that I cite out of the Directory, that if there be not a promise of these saving graces to Infants, in vain are they baptized, and the seal is put to a blanke. And this consequence he denies, but saith nothing to that which was indeed my reason, which was this, Master Marshal's second conclusion is to be understood as the words in the Directory, this Master Marshall grants, but the words of the Directory speake of a promise of saving Grace. This I prove, 1. Because the same promise is said to be made to the Believers seed, which is made to Believers, for it were a strange equivocation to understand the same terme in the same proposition in two different senses, but the promise made to Believers there meant, is the promise of saving Grace, ergo so is the promise to their seed. 2. Because the words speake of the same promise before, in the direction concerning Doctrine, which they meane after in the direction for petition, else there would be a *Cathurnus*, which were absurd, but in the petition they mean the promises of saving Grace, therefore also in the Doctrine. As for that which Master Marshall makes my conclusion from the words of the Directory, that in vain are they baptized, the Seal is put to a blanke : It is no inference from the words of the Directory, but comes in in another period, at least fourteene lines after, and among other reasons it is a medium to prove that the second conclusion must be so understood, because that is the plea they make for Infant-baptisme, and therfore unless it be so understood, they must revoke that plea. M. Garet Pag. 13. (if I understand him aright) makes this the sense of the Directory, the promise is made to Believers and their seed, that is, it is to be presumed in charity of all the Infants of Believers, that they enjoy the inward graces of the promise till they discover the contrary. Wherein, though he grant that which I contend for, that

that in the *Directory* the promise is meant of saving Grace, yet he hath invented another shift to save the credit of the assertion of Master *Marshall* and the *Directory*, which he confesseth, if it be taken as I conceive it is, is so manifestly against Protestant principles and experience that none can hold it. But who would ever construe those words, *The promise is made to Believers and their seed; that is, it is to be presumed in charity of all the Infants of Believers, that they enjoy the inward graces of the promise, till they discover the contrary,* but he that would make mens words like a nose of waxe, to turne them which way he is willing they should be taken? would any man construe the words [*the promise is made to Believers*] any otherwise then thus, the promise of saving Grace is made by God to Believers? and must the same phrasie in the same proposition in the other part be construed thus [*the promise is made to the seed of Believers*] that is, *it is to be presumed by men in charity till they discover the contrary, that all the Infants of Believers have the inward graces of the Covenant.* As if the making of a Covenant were all one with a charitable presumption, or the seed of Believers were all one with Infants, or when they are adulti they are not their seed. The Apostle *Rom. 9. 6, 7, 8.* when he expounded the promise, *Gen. 17. 7.* of the spirituall, not the naturall seed, did not imagine, that the making the promise was mans act of presumption, but Gods act, and *Acts 2. 39.* (to which and *Gen. 17. 7.* it's likely the *Directory* alludes) the promise, as Master *Marshall* expounds it, is of Christ and his saving benefits, and the making of it is meant of Gods act, not mans presumption. Adde hereunto that the whole series of the direction in the *Directory* carries the meaning thus. For having said, that *Baptisme is a Seale of the Covenant of Grace, of our ingrafting into Christ, and of our union with him, of remission of sins, regeneration, adoption, and life eternall,* it followes after, that the seed and posterity of the faithfull borne within the Church, have by their birth interest in the Covenant, and right to the Seale of it, and to the outward priviledges of the Church, &c. where the *Directory* makes a threefold interest: First interest in the Covenant. Secondly, right to the Seale of it. Thirdly, right to the outward priviledges of the Church, the Covenant, Seale, and outward Priviledges of the Church are put as distinct things, and the Covenant they have interest in, is the same Covenant

An Apologie for the two Treatises

nant of which Baptisme is a Seale, as is plaine by the Pronoune [it] which imports the same thing : Now Baptisme is before said to be the Seale of the Covenant of saving Graces, therefore the Covenant that the seed of Beleevers have interest in by their birth according to the *Directory*, is the Covenant of saving Graces. Which sith Master *Marshall* dares not assert , and Mr *Geree* saith is manifestly against Protestant principles, I wishit were as it ought to be laid to heart, and that the Assembly would remember that which they say Pag 30. of the answer to the Remonstrance of the seven dissenting Brethren. *Ana it was further declared, that even in those things which the Assembly had voted, and transmitted to both Houses of Parliament ; yet we did not so leane to our own understandings, nor so prize our votes ; but that if these Brethren should hold forth such light answers as might convince us of an errour : we should not only desire the Parliament to give us leave to revise our votes, but to revoke them, if there should be cause.* Which would indeed bring much honour to the Assembly, and knit the hearts of the godly to them : whereas through their silence at this time, this and some other things in the *Directory* about baptism passing uncorrected, & standing confirmed by Law, great disquiet to the Church of God, and the undoing or molesting of many godly persons, may follow when they cannot yeeld without sin to the Doctrine and practise of Baptisme as it is there set downe. This by the way.

S. 10.
Of the distinction of inward and outward Covenant, and that it can stand Master *Marshall* in no stead, but to shew his trifling, and equivocating in his first argument, and two first conclusions, and of M. *Marshall's* mistake of my opinion.

But Mr. *Marshall* tells me pag. 10. of his *Defence*, you cannot be ignorant how our Divines owne the outward administration of the Covenant under the notion of *Fædus externum* and the spirituall grace of it under the notion of *Fædus internum* : and that still I restraine the Covenant to the spirituall part onely ; and would perswade my reader, that they who speake of the Covenant of Grace, must meane it thus strictly ; and yet I bring not arguments to disprove a true visible membership upon a visible profession, whether the inward saving grace be known or not. To this I answer. I confess I have met with that distinction of *fædus externum* & *internum*, in some Protestant writers, but not meeting with it in Mr *Marshall's* Sermon, I had no occasion in my *Examen* to meddle with it but now I will declare my thoughts of it. I confess that Circumcision is called the covenant, Gen. 17. 13. by a metonymy of the thing signified for the signe, as the text it selfe expounds it; and

and I confess that the Apostle Rom. 2. 28. distinguisheth of *Circumcision outward in the flesh, and circumcision of the heart*: but no where in Scripture doe I meet with the distinction of the outward and inward Covenant, nor doe I conceive the expression right. For if the distinction be only *distinctio nominis*, it should be thus, Covenant is taken either properly or improperly by a trope, and not Covenant is either outward or inward, if the distinction be *distinctio rei*: then there is some common notion of a Covenant thus distributed, and so the sense must be; some Covenants, that is, promises (for the nature of a Covenant is a mutual or single promise) are either externall or internall, and this may be understood either in respect of the making of the promise, and so it is not right for all promises in that sense are externall, none internall. for afore it be declared by some transcendent act it is not a promise, but an intention, or else it may be understood in respect of the thing promised, and it is confessed that God promiseth inward, and outward good things, and if this were the meaning I should not much except against it, though I should like it better to expresse it thus. The things covenanted are outward or inward, which is plain and easie to be understood, then to say, the Covenant is outward, or inward. But Mr Marshall by the outward Covenant means the outward administration of it, and by the inward Covenant the spirituall grace of it. According to which explication the distinction is not agreeable to Logick rules, nor can stand Mr Marshall in any stead, but to convince him of trifling and equivocating in his first argument, and two first conclusions. Trifling I say in his first argument. For the first argument was this. *The infants of beleeving parents are fæderati, therefore they must be signati.* Now Mr Marshall will not have the antecedent understood of the inward Covenant, that is the spirituall grace; he blames me for that, and he himselfe rejects it in that sense; then the sense must be, the infants of beleeving parents are fæderati, that is in the outward Covenant of Grace, that is according to Mr Marshall in the outward administration of the Covenant, Now what is the outward administration he expresseth pag. 48. of his Sermon, calling Baptisme the new administration, and Circumcision the old. This then is Mr Marshals argument. The infants of beleevers are in the outward Covenant, that is, in the

An Apologie for the two Treatises

46

outward administration, meaning Baptisme or Circumcision; this is the antecedent, the consequent or conclusion is, therefore they must be *signati*; that is, baptized or circumcised. But is not this a meer inept tautology; all one as to prove they must be baptised, because they must be baptized; all one as to argue, he must have *ensem*, because he must have *gladium*; this is *Pauls Epistle*, because this is *Pauls letter*. I said equivocating. For by the Covenant *Mr Marshall* makes shew of one thing in the first conclusion, but meanes another in the second. For he had said conclusion the first, *The Covenant of Grace for substance hath been alwayes the same*, and pag. 10. he shewes wherein lies the substance of it; to wit, the spirituall part; now who would not have expected that the second conclusion should be meant of the same Covenant to wit the inward; sith he sayes, pag. 26. *The proving the two first conclusions gains the whole cause, if the Covenant be the same, and children belong to it, then they are to be owned as Covenanter*? yea, and his first text to prove the second conclusion, *Acts 2. 39.* he himselfe expounds it of *Christ and saving benefits by him*. But it seems *Mr Marshall's* heart failes him, he found that assertion too hot for him, though that be the ordinary assertion, in the Directory, in books and Sermons, insomuch that it is an usuall expression to say *infants are confederates with their believing parents in the Covenant of Grace*; and therefore now, the second conclusion, *that the children of believers belong to the Covenant of Grace*, must be understood in another sence then as the Covenant of Grace is taken in the first conclusion, which is to equivocate. Yea further by reading *Mr Marshall's* defence, pag. 92. and elsewhere I suspect there is a farther equivocation in *Mr Marshall's* argument, which *Mr Marshall* it seems doth not perceive, divers expressions being by him taken as the same, which are not the same; nor to be confounded. For, pag. 92. *Mr Marshall* speaks thus; *I concluded therefore that by Gads own will, such as enter into Covenant ought to receive the seale*, which seems to be the Proposition by which the sequel of *Mr Marshall's* first argument is to be proved, so that he seems to frame the Syllogisme entirely thus. They that enter into Covenant ought to receive the seale, but the children of believers enter into Covenant, therefore they ought to receive the seale; so that the minor seems to him to be

all

all one with this Proposition : *the children are federati*, which is elsewhere expounded of the outward Covenant, or the right to be baptized, but to have right to be baptized, is not all one with entring into Covenant. Entring into Covenant is some act farther then having of right; for a person may have right to Baptism before he enters into Covenant. *Mr Marshall* should have heedfully distinguished the Covenant of Grace, which is Gods act in his promise of grace; and belongs to none but those he hath made that promise to, and the outward administration, which is the administratours act; and not have called it the Covenant, and the entring into Covenant with God, which is the act of the baptized, and cannot be done ordinarily by an infant, who is onely passive, and makes no promise at Baptisme; and therefore cannot be rightly said to enter into Covenant with God. The want of such distinctnesse in expression serves for no other purpose but to puzzle a reader, and the very truth is, the argument which *Mr Marshall*, *Mr Goree*, Doctor *Homes*, &c. bring from the Covenant to the Seale for the baptizing Infants, if it be well sifted, is either a Tautology, or an equivocation; as I may more abundantly shew, if ever I have liberty to examine their intangled discourses. Now from hence he may know the reason why I still restraine the Covenant to the spirituall part only, which is, because I love to speake plainly without equivocation, and as the Scripture doth, and why I wold perswade the Reader, that they who speake of the Covenant of Grace must meant it thus strictly, because I would have it thought they do not equivocate, but speake plainly. And for bringing arguments to disprove a true visible membership upon a visible profession, whether the inward grace be known or not, I marvell Master Marshall should expect this of me, who never denied a true visible membership upon a visible profession, whether the inward Grace be known or not, but in expressie termes granted it ; and therefore Master Marshall doth untruely charge me, when he saies Pag. 112. *This mistake runs through your whole booke*, that none are to be reputed to have a visibleright to the Covenant of Grace, but onely such as partake of the saving Graces of it. And yet Mr Marshall acknowledgeth Pag. 223. of his Defence the contrary, when he saith, *to all this you assent, and consequently that there is nothing needfull according to the Word, but a visibleright*. But Master Marshall addes;

An Apologie for the two Treatises

addes ; and then what will become of all your pleading, That because we cannot know that all Infants of Believers have the inward Grace, we may not therefore baptize them. This Master Marshall makes all my pleading, but Master Marshall neither doth nor can shew that this is all or any part of my pleading. Master Marshall Pag. 222. hath these words : *And as for that you adde, That Baptisme is to be administered, not to them who may have Grace, but to them who have it.* Then it seemes they are all wrongly baptiz'd who have not inward grace. But how doth this follow from my words, with any shew of right deduction ? That because I say, it is not enough that Baptism be administered to persons, in that they may have Grace, but it is to be administered to them that have it, that therefore it seemes they are all wrongly baptiz'd who have not inward Grace, unlesse my speech had been, that it is to be administered to none but them that have it, which cannot be drawne from my words, till it be proved that every affirmative proposition is exclusive, which true Logick will disclaime. He that saith, A Coate is not a mans because he may buy it, but because he hath bought it, doth not affirme that he only hath a Coate by right that hath bought it, for he may have right to it another way, viz. by legacy. My pleading is, because we have no command, we cannot baptize Infants without will-worship according to ordinary rule, sith the command is only to baptize Disciples, or such as professe faith. I grant that if any be a reall actuall Believer that cannot speake, yet if he professe the Faith by other signes, or God do reveale it for him he may be baptiz'd by the force of Philips rule, *Acts 8 38.* and Peters speech, *Acts 10 47.* But he that saith, reall actuall Believers may be baptiz'd, doth not thereby affirme that they only are to bee baptiz'd. *A proprio primo modo ad proprium secundo modo non valet argumentum.* All Crows are black, therefore only Crows are black, is no good argument. Master Marshall tells me Pag 95. that he is confident, that I who durst baptize an Infant known to be regenerate, durst not give the other Sacrament to it ; because more is required to make them capable of that Sacrament, then is required to make them capable of Baptisme : a regenerate Infant I think is capable of this : but besides regeneration, he is sure I will grant, that an examination of a mans selfe, and an ability to discerne the Lords Body, is required to one capable of that. To put him out of doubt, I say ; upon the same

same supposition that God should regenerate, and make an infant an actuall believer I should as soone give the Lords supper as baptism to it, as conceiving that the same actuall faith that makes capable of the one makes capable of the other, and the same supernaturall extraordinary power that begets actuall faith can beget selfe examination and discerning the Lords body. And thus I have answered that accusation of spending a whole sheet of paper together in confuting what was never intended by my adversary, and have retorted this point of sophistry as more justly chargeable on himselfe.

But Mr Marshall hath yet more of sophistry to charge me with, and thus he speakes pag. 3. of his defence. But first give me leave to observe your destructive artifice. It is the Socinians way to elude all texts of Scripture, which are urged agai:st them, if they have been differently expounded by learned and godly men, ancient or moderne: to question all conclusions infer'd by consequence from Scripture: to deride the testimonies of any of the Ancients by discovering the nakednesse, errour, and oversight of those reverend men: and by making themselves merry by turning the Orationes, Epistles, or allusions of the Fathers into syllogismes, and by inserting of ergo now and then, to make all their rhetorickall passages seeme ridiculous. I appeal to the judicious reader, whither this plot be not carried through your Examen and exercitation.

II. Of Master Marshall false and most unjust charge that I carry the Socinia nplot through my examen and exercitation.

It is a very sad thing that brethren should thus yeeld either to their passion; or zeale of God but not according to knowledge, so as to paint out their opponents in as ougly a forme as they can without cause. Mr Marshall appeals to the judicious reader, and I am very willing to accept of the appeale, provided that under the terme, Judicious reader, he do not meane one that is resolved to gainsay whatsoever is contrary to the streme of other reformed Churches, or the present Synod, or that may endanger his present station, or carried away with prejudice, and passion. He desires to observe my destructive artifice. If he meane my skill to overthrow his arguments I confess it, it was my businesse, if he meanes something else when he names it he may have an answere. He tells me what the Socinians way is, and would have it thought that is my way. For the Socinians way, I have read Mr Cheynels discourse, but remember not that their way is de-

An Apologie for the two Treatises

50

scribed as Mr Marshall sets it downe. I have read very little either in *Socinian*, or any *Socinian*. In that which I have read I confess I finde much shitting and impudence in eluding the scriptures urged against them, *Christianus Germanus Exercit.* Theolog. 20. hath collected 38 examples hereof. I finde that they make little account of the testimonies of the Ancients, since the first *Nicene Council* in the point of Christs Deity, yet they allege thowt afore the *Nicene Council* in that point, and sometimes others of the Ancients. But it is more easie for Mr Marshall to affirme thento prove any such *Socinian* plot in my *Examen* or *exercitation*, though Mr Marshall could not but know, that an adversary could hardly shew more malice, and do more mischiefe to a man then by bringing him into suspition as if he were of a *Socinian* spirit. He saies, it is the *Socinian* way to elude all Texts of scripture which are urged against them if they have been differently expounded by learned and godly men, ancient or modern. The truth is, though *Socinians* do use this art, yet their proper devise is, so farre as I have observed, to elude by new interpretations of their owne. But what one Text have I eluded in an such manner? If there be any, it is either i Cor. 7. 14. or Coloss. 2. 11, 12. For the first, though it is true I alleage eleven Authors expounding as I do, and might make a further addition, and there was great reason I should do it, because of the prejudice that was against my interpretation, yet that was not it which I rested upon, but the Analysis of the words, which being rightly stated, I found upon reason, to which neither Mr Marshall nor Mr Gere have yet answered, that the sense I gave must needs be right. And it was confessed to me by a learned man of the Assembly, that he thought matrimonial Holmes was not all that was meant there, yet that I had sufficienly overthrowne that of federal Holmes. Mr Marshall though he have altered my method and forme in clearing that text, and so obscured my elucidations of it, yet could finde eight arguments there against his opinion. And for the other text it hath been shewed before that Mr Marshall confesseth my sense to be his sense. The truth is, my expositions of texts are in most of them so cleare that Mr Marshall himselfe doth grant them, though he differ from me in the inferences from them. He saies further, it is the *Socinian* way to question all conclusions inferred by consequence.

H

consequence from Scripture. This is the first time that ever I heard them to be charged with this.. but rather finde them by Mr Cheynel and others charged with assenting to nothing but what they could conceive rationall. I remember Docter Chaloner in his *Credo Ecclesiam Catholicam* mentions this as the artifice of the jesuites in France to stop the mouthes of Protestants by rejecting consequences, and requiring expresse texts, which being invented by Veron, was called *methodus Veroniana*, the vanity of which is refuted by Vedelins in a treatise of his. I remember I saw a printed paper taken as it is sayd from the mouth of Captaine Paul Hobson against Infant baptism, wherein was somewhat spoken against consequences, which I disclaime. Yea, I expressly say pag. 110. of my Examen, But I grant, that if you make it good, by good consequence, you may recover all. I confess I do reject the consequence drawne from the command of Circumcis-
sion to baptism by reason of analogy, and all such analogies as being vaine yet too much pestering later, and former writings and Sermons. It is the speech of Mr Rutherford, due right of Presbyteries, Ch. 2. sect. 2. pag. 37. proportions are weake proba-
tions. But it is an overlaſhing to purpose in Mr Marshal to say,
that I carry this Socinian plot through my examen and exercitacion
to question all conclusions infer'd by consequence from Scripture.
Though Mr Marshal in this matter appeares not to be the man
I tooke him to be, yet I hope he is not come to Calumniare unda-
ter. I presume the Juſticious reader will judge, that Mr Marshal
is bound to give me satisfaction for wronging my credit, of which
he shoule be more tender, by so deep, & yet so palpable a falle ac-
cution. Mr Marshal makes this the Socinian way to deride the re-
ſtimonies of the Ancients. Of what they do I can ſay little. But
I challenge Mr Marshall to give one instance wherein I make my
ſelfe meerly by turning the orations, epiftles, or alluſions of the Fa-
thers into ſyllogiſmes, and by inserting of ergo now and then to make
all their rhetorickall paſſages ſeem ridiculous. As for deriding the
reſtimonies of any of the Ancients by discovering the nakedneſſe,
&c. I do it no otherwise then the moſt approved Protestant wri-
ters Rivet, Perkins, Cooke, Jannes, Century-writers, Chamire,
Jewel, Reynolds, &c. yea and many of the Papists themſelves,
Sixtus Scu[n]ds, Bellarmine, &c. who uſually diſclaime ſome wri-

52

An Apologie for the two Treatises

tings of the Ancients as spurious, and many speeches of the most approved as absurd and erroneous : yea, Mr Marshall himselte in the points of infant Communion, rebaptization, necessity of Baptisme and Communion in his *Defence*, derides Cyprian and Augustinus as much as I doe in my *Examen* in the point of Infant-Baptisme. Mr Marshall sayes my maine faculty lies in the anascensastical part, but that I bring not satisfying arguments to settle men in that I would have. But Mr Marshall might remember my businesse in my *exercitation*, and *Examen* is to discover the nullity of the pleas that are made for Infant-Baptisme, in which if I had done no more but overthrowne the prootes that are brought out of Scripture, it had been enough. Whereas I have further shewed upon erroneous grounds it was taught of old, and what abusis haue followed it : which surely Smeclymnus, and Dawlphintramis in their pleading against *Episcopacy* and *Liturgy* thought sufficient; however in this point Mr Marshall censures my *exercitation* and *Examen* as insufficient. When Smeclymnus had disputed down *Episcopacy* and *Liturgy*, they conceived they had done their part, though they referred it to the Synod to consult how to lette Church Government and worship. And why should not my disputing be thought edifying to the Church of God by overthrowing an errorre and abuse, which will in time be found worse then *Episcopacy* and *Liturgy*, though I take not upon me to direct how Baptisme is to be reduced to the right way, neverthelesse when I am duly required to declare my opinion either about the nullity of Poedobaptisme as it is used, or the way of reducing Baptisme to its right use, whether according to conscience or prudence which I doubt not but may be done in time without necessity of separation, turning leekers, or popular tumult, though for the present generation by reason of preengagemens, mens spirits are very averse from it, I shall be willing to doe it, as being resolved; notwithstanding the unkind usage I have found, yet to remember my Covenant and account to God. And as I have not hitherto, so neither I hope in God ever shall foster any *Crypticall Divinity*, of which I need be ashamed to bring it into light, or which shold justly cause men to be jealous of me as a dangerous person likely to trouble the Church, though unbrother-like Mr Marshall pag. 76. endevours to represent me as if I were one that had need to be watched.

watched. He talkes not in a letter to me in private, but in print, of my high and scornfull spirit, but how justly may appeare by this *Apology*. He tells me, I magisterially tread down under foot the arguments and reasons whch others conceive strong. But it will be hard for Mr Marshall to shew where I tread down any thing magisterially, that is without cogent reasons; and such, as were it not for his mistakes of my reasons, he himselfe would be forced to subscribe to them.

As for questioning so boldly some Doctrines which have never been questioned before, I suppose he meanes it of that which I said Pag. 23. of my Examen about rebaptization, which Master Marshall saies doth clearly discover my iuch after new opinions, Pag. 67. of his Defence, and that which I say Pag 85. of my Examen, concerning the quetion, whether an unbaptized person may in no case eat the Lords Supper, this Master Marshall Pag. 167. of his Defence, numbers amongst my freakes and out-leapes, and saies is a spicke of my iuch after singular opinions. But Master Marshall might have observed, that in the former, I gave the reason of what I said, because it goes so curr: n, that rebaptization is not only an error, but also an Heresie; plainly shewing there was a necessity that cryed out against the Anabaptists as Heretikes, to bring a demonstrative reason to prove it unlawfull to baptize againe him that had been rightly baptized. For I presume, hat as King James censured Carnall Peron for making a kind of problematicall Martyrs, calling them Martyres that dyed in maintenance of a point not certain whether it were de fide, so it is as absurd for our Preachers to make problematicall Hereticks, by declaiming and exciting the Magistrate against those as Hereticks, of whom it is uncertainte whether they hold an error or no. As for Master Marshalls reasons, they are not convincing to me, nor is the holding rebaptization such a new opinion as he would make it. And for the other it is no out-leape, but a question that lay in my way by reason of Master Marshalls words, and exceeding necessary to be resolved, considering that otherwise thole Ministers and people that cannot agree about the validity of Infant-baptisme, or adult-baptisme, supposed not to be rightly done, for want of a right Ministry, or power to give the Spirit, or the manner of it's administration, must of necessity separate from Communion in the Lords Supper for this reason, be-

An Apologie for the two Treatises

54

cause none is to be admitted to the Lords Supper till he be rightly baptized : which I professe is to be stood upon in point of prudence for right order; yet if it be stood upon in point of conscience, so as in no case the contrary is to be permitted, it will of necessity make many superstitious perplexities in Ministers, and inferre many an unnecessary Schisme, this being not a sufficient reason for a refusall of Communion, because a Godly person takes his baptism to be right though I know the contrary. Nor do I thinke the thing either such a new opinion or practise. For besides, that it may be doubted whether all the Apostles were baptized, as suppose *Matthew* (which is as probable for the negative as the affirmative) yet were admitted to the Lords Supper by Christ himselfe: when *Constantine* the Great and others did differre their baptism so long, it is not likely they never received the Lords Supper afore their baptism. Nor is it inconsistent with my grants: For what though I grant *that Baptisme is the way and manner of solemn admission into the Church*, meaning the regular way, yet it followes not that none may receive in any case afore baptized. Mr *Marshall* holds Ordination by a Presbytery is the regular way of solemn admission into the office of publike Preaching, and it may be fit by an Ecclesiasticall Canon to order it so; yet I thinke it will not be denied, but that there may be cases, wherein a person may lawfully be a publike Preacher without such ordination. The other grant which Master *Marshall* saies is mine, was never expressed by me so rawly as he laies it downe. It is not as he puts it downe, *that nothing is to be done about the Sacraments, whereof we have not either institution or example*: but as Master *Marshall* might have perceived if he had heeded my words, Examen, Pag. 28. Pag. 110. Pag. 152. *That no positive worship, or essentiall, or substanciall part of it, is to be done without institution by precept, or Apostolical example*, I never denied, that many things pertaining to circumstance and order may be done about the Sacraments without either, and of this kind I conceive Baptizing afore eating the Lords Supper to be. As for *such other new opinions*, why are not Doctor *Twisse*, and Master *Gataker*, and indeed all that cleere truth more fully then others, censured in the like manner? I wish if my words would take any impression on him, that Master *Marshall* would forbear thus judging least he be judged. I thinke I know my selfe better then

Master

Master Marshall, and I told him, my reall intention was to discover truth, yea all my wayes shew me free from this itch after new opinions, though I profess me selfe an impartiall searcher of truth, *nullius addictū jurare in verba magistri*, no not to the determinations of the Assembly. May it not with better reason be said, they have an itch after new opinions, who hold that without power to suspend all scandalous persons from the Lords Supper, a man cannot with a good conscience be a Pastour, that without this power the Church of Christ is to be suspended from the Lords Supper many yeares, &c. And for sleighting of authors, I have answered it already.

There is yet another Charge, as if I should alleudge Authors against their mind. As first Master Daniel Rogers. I laid Master Daniel Rogers in his *Treatise of the Sacrament of Baptisme*, Part. I. Pag. 79. confessed himself unconvinced by demonstration of Scripture for it. Master Marshall writes to Master Daniel Rogers, he answers in these words: If I were to answer that Anabaptist, I should answer him silencio, & contemptu: for why should I not? since in that very place of my *Sacramentes*, Part. I. Pag. 78. 79. where I confute those Schismaticks, he snatches my words from their own Defence: My words are, I confess me self unconvinced by any demonstration of Scripture for Pedobaptisme, meaning by any positive Text; what is that to helpe him? except I thought there were no other arguments to convince it; now what I think of that, my next words shew, Pag. 77. line 4. 5. 6. 7. I need not transcribe them. In a word, this I say, though I know none, yet that is no argument for the non-baptizing of Infants, since so many Scriptures are sufficiently convincing for it. Therefore this want of a positive Text must no more exclude Infants, &c. then the like reason should disannull a Christian Sabbath, or men kind not to be partakers of the Supper: The quoting of mine owne text were enough. I will set down his words as I find them, that the Reader may judge whether there be truth in it, that I have snatched his words from their own Defence, and whether he did not oppose demonstration of Scripture to unwritten tradition. The words are thus: I say this for the scolding of such as are not wilfull, that take the baptism of Infants to be one of the most reverend, generall, and uncontrovred traditions which the Church hath, and which I would no lesse doubt of then the Creed to be Apostolical. And although I confess me selfe

S. 13.
Of alleadging
Authors a-
gainst their
mind, particu-
lar Mr Daniel
Rogers, M. Ball,
Chamier, Are-
tius, and Beza.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

1 Cor. 7.14.

yet unconvinced by demonstration of Scripture for it, yet first sithence Circumcision was applied to the Infants the eighth day in the Old Testament: Secondly there is no words in the New Testament to infringe the liberty of the Church in it, nor speciall reason why we should bereave her of it. Thirdly, sundry Scrptures affoord some friendly proofes by consequent of it. Fourthly, the holinesse of the child (extermal and visible) is from their parents, who are (or ought to be) charchised confessors, penitents, and Protestants in truth (which privilege only open revolt disabiles them from) therefore I say, the Seed being holy, and belonging to the Covenant, the Lord graciously admits them also to the Seal of it in Baptisme. If Master Marshall please he may write backe to his reverend and learned friend, that the suppoed Anabaptist thinks his plaister too narrow for the sore, that he seems to eate his own words, that his words help me to shew that he once thought it indeed one of the most reverend, generall, and uncontroled traditions which the Church hath, and which he would no leffe doubt of, then the Creed to be Apostolicall, which if he meane it of the Creed called the Apostles as it is now, Parker in his booke *de descensu ad inferos*, and others have shewed to have been made long after the Apostles dayes, and the tale of their meeting to compose it, in the exposition on the Creed, attributed to *Kuffinus*, or some other to be of no credit. And for Scripture, Master Rogers findes but friendly proofes, somewhat like Bellarmains *pi & probabilitas credi potest*, and that there is no word in the New Testament to infringe the liberty of the Church in it: which if Master Rogers can satisfie himself with, he may, I professe I dare not so play with my own conscience, and I thought this was fit to be told Master Marshall, to shew that I was not the only man that questioned, whether his proofes for Infant-baptisme were so undeniable as he would have them; and that's enough to shew the unreasonableness of the violence of his spirit against those that differ from him. And for his *Quare* why he should not answer me, *silencio & contemptus*: I presume Master Marshall hath long since done that office of a friend to tell him it is written *Rom. 14.10. Why doest thou set at naught thy brother?*

I had said not as Mr Marshall repeats it, Master Ball cuts the sinewes of the argument from Circumcision, but, me thinkes Mr Balls words cut the sinewes of that argument. And so they do plainly.

ly. For if however Circumcision and Baptisme agree or differ wee must looke to the institution, and the agreement is not enough to conclude, that Baptisme belongs onely to members in Church-Covenant, and their children, because it was so in Circumcision without an institution, as the new England Elders reason, by the same reason however Baptisme and Circumcision agree or differ : yet Baptisme will not belong to Infants, because Circumcision did so by vertue of proportion, without an institution, which if Mr Ball or Mr Marshall could shew, they needed not trouble us with the Command about Circumcision of male infants, to prove Infant-Baptisme, which is indeed to maintain that the ceremoniall law still binds, which is plain Judaisme. But what layes Mr Marshall to this? If Mr Marshall cut the sinewes of the argument from Circumcision to Baptisme, himselfe was very much mistaken in his own meaning and intention, because in the same place he makes them parallell in this, and I might have done well to have informed the reader so much. I was told, there was a very intelligent man that said he was sorry that I had Mr Marshall for my Antagonist, as knowing him to be apt to mistake, which he conceived would be a vexation to me, and indeed I find his words true. For whereas I said only Mr Ball's words, cut the sinewes of that argument; M. Mar. mistakes it as if I had laid, Mr Ball intends to cut the sinews of that argument, and that then he was mistaken in his own meaning and intentions. I confess it were a very strange thing to charge so understanding a man as Mr Ball with such a mistake of his owne meaning and intention : but it is no such strange thing for a learned man to speak that which may be brought to inferre the contrary to that he intended, and if this be to abuse men, then all arguments by retortion are abuses. Bellarmin l.5 de justificatione c.7 prop.3. had said, propter incertitudinem propriae justitiae & periculum inanis glorie tutissimum est totam fiduciam in sola Dei misericordia & benignitate reponere. This, King James in his Apologie for the oath of Allegiance brings to prove that he overthrowes thereby all his former dispute about inherent righteousness, though Bellarmine had put in a speciall caution in the next words to prevent that inference, and King James left out that caution in the recitall, yet Bishop Andrewes in his Tortura Torti, and many other learned men justified King James, and that rightly.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

Mr Marshall, pag. 47. saith thus. And I am sure you must agree with me. Sixthly, that of all these testimonies you have cited out of Chamier, there is not one word against my interpretation, or for the justification of yours; yea and I know also that you will agree with me. Seventhly, that the learned Chamier in a large dispute doth confute your interpretation and vindicate my interpretation, as the onely true and proper meaning of this text even in that very place, where you quote him. And therefore I know the reader will agree with mee (whether you doe or no) that you doe but abuse your Author and Reader both, in making a flourish with Chamiers name nothing to the purpose, and thereby mouldon to the Reader to conceave Chamier to be of your side, when he is paine-blanke against you. And in the same page. First you severall times vise the learned Beza as if he were of your mind in the interpretation of this text, to construe it of matrimoniall holiness. I confess the cause depends not upon Beza's judgement, but your reputation depends much upon making this good, that you shold dare to cite an Author as interpreting it for you, who interprets it ex professo against you. p. 159. I persuade my self you are by this time ashamed of your impertinent quotation, I assure my selfe if you be not, your friends are. p. 157. But Sir why do you thus frequently abuse your Readers with the names of learned men, inserting some one sentence of theirs into your booke, and thereby insinuating to your Reader, tha they are of your opinion in the point wherein you cite them? I assure you, it concernes your conscience as well as your cause, to be thus oftentaken hardy. Mr Gerec vindic. Paedobaptism. pag. 22. which you expresse in Beza's words, but against Beza's mind. pag. 28. And therefore I wonder you shold so often alledge an Author impertinently, especially such an uno us is punctually and rationally against you. To all this I answer. If Mr Marshall could have shewed that I had either falsified the words or wristed their meaning, he had said somthing; but to tell me, because I allege the words of authors according to their meaning, to prove the contrary to that they hold, therefore I abuse them; and infuse me to the Reader that they are of my mind, or side, when they are paine-blanke against me, or that my allegation is impertinent, do nothing to the purpose (is so blvolois a charge, that it deserves no other answere, than Mr Marshall's own words) out of Horace, pag. 254. tis from a man which I say my friends be ashamed of

of my impertinent quotations, it is because Mr Marshall and Mr Geree have misrepresented them, otherwise those my quotations are every one of them pertinent to the particular point I allege them for, and not yet answered by Mr Geree or Mr Marshall. And I confess I cannot but smile at Mr Marshall's conceit of me, when he says. And I am sure you must agree with me. Sixthly, that in all these testimonies you have cited out of Chamier, there is not one word against my interpretation or for the justification of yours; as if I were another Claudius to subscribe to my own condemnation: which if I doe in this thing, he may well beg me for a toole. It is untruly ascribed to me that I cite Beza, as if he were of my mind in the interpretation of 1 Cor. 7. 14. to construe it of matrimoniall holinessse. For whereas I did distinctly explain first the term sanctified in the forepart of the verse & then the terms unclean & holy in the latter (which Mr. Marshall confounding in his defence; & to putting all my arguments together to the number of eight, as he multiplies them, & not sorting them as I did, hath made his answers colourable, but indeed misleads the unwary Reader) and though I knew Beza to disagree from me in expounding the term [holy] which I had expressly set down, pag. 16. of my *exercitation*; and therefore never intended to abuse the Reader, or to intinuate that he was of my side, in the expounding the latter part of the verse, yet he expounds the first part with me of matrimoniall sanctification, and so I said, pag. 73 57, of my *Examen*, not that Beza did construe it of matrimoniall holiness, but matrimoniall sanctification, which I should wonder Mr. Marshall did not consider being so plainly and necessarily distinguished by me, but that distemper of body or mind, or hast to prevent the studying of my book by crying it down (the like whereto may be said of Doctor Homer and Mr. Geree) made him compote his answer before hee had well studied my book. As for Chamier I did, pag. 76. expressly say his opinion was for federal holinessse. *No federal illa sanctitate quid dicam? veritatem vobis Chamiero Calvinum, &c.* and yet I need not be ashamed to bring his own words against his own tenet, no more then King James to bring Bellarmine's words against him, or Bishop Morton to bring the Papists words against them, or Mr. Marshall himselfe to bring my words against me, but rather indeed it is most commendable to bring an authors

An Apologie for the two Treatises

words to refute his own opinion as being a most cogent and pertinent way of disputing. And for *Aretius* pag. 92. of my *Examen*, I used this very expression [*sayes rightly in this*] intimating that though he agree with M. *Marshall* in his inference from *Col. 2. 11.* 12. yet those words which I cited, and that rightly, served to overthrow Mr. *Marshall's* reason, from whence their inference is gathered. And therefore it concernes Mr. *Marshall's* conscience as well as his cause to be thus often taken tardy in false accusations, & insinuations against me. As for that he tells me of *Aretius* his opinion there and elsewhere, it is indeed a meer impertinency; sith I never denied *Aretius* to be of his opinion, and therefore if I may use his own phrake, pag. 147. *he doth but bumbast his booke to no purpose.*

S. 14.
Of Master
Marshall's un-
just charging
Anabaptists,
with a bloody
sentence, con-
coademing
all the infants
of beleevers as
having no-
thing to doe
with the Cove-
nant of
Grace; his im-
puting to me as
if I held that
they all belong
actually to
the kingdome
of the Devill,
no more pro-
misse for them
then for chil-
dren of Turks,
their actuall
standing in
the visible
kingdome of
the Devill.

And here I cannot but take notice, that whereas Master *Marshall* had charged in the first use of his Sermon the Anabaptists with a rash and bloody sentence condemning all the infants of the whole Church of Christ, as having nothing to doe with the Covenant of Grace or the seale of it, and then aggravates it as like Hazael's act, I said, pag. 170. of my *Examen*, till you produce some testimonies of those you call Anabaptists so determining, I shall take it to be but a false accusation, and a fruit of passion, not of holy zeale. Mr. *Marshall* both pag. 5. and pag. 243. of his *Defence*, saith thus. *I compared not their intentions with his, but the fruits of their principles casting all beleevers children, as much out of the covenant of Grace as they doe the children of Turks and Pagans;* and this I am sure they doe, and your selfe joyn with them who acknowledge no more promise for the children of beleevers, then for the children of the Turkes, and leave them to have their actuall standing in the visible kingdome of the Devill.

In this reply Mr. *Marshall* brings no testimony out of the Anabaptists writings to prove them guilty of that rash, and bloody sentence he doth in expresse termes charge them with; suppose Mr. *Marshall* should be able (which I am assured he cannot do) to prove by consequence that by their principles, they condemn all the infants of the whole Church of Christ, as having nothing to doe with the Covenant of Grace, or the Seale of it (which were the words of his Sermon: pag. 52. though in his defense he alter the words to mince the matter) yee Davenant exhorteth to brotherly communion, Ch. 2. *Gataker vindication against Walker,* and many

many other cry out against it as most unreasonable to accuse men of that sentence which them selves disclaime, because it followes from their principles by remote consequence, much more in down-right termes to say, they passe a bloody sentence, and condemn all the infants of believers. If it should follow from their principles, yet Mr Marshall were not acquit from rashnes, false accusation and passion in those his speeches. I have proved from Mr Marshall's principle, pag. 35. of his Sermon that all Gods commands and institutions about the Sacraments of the Jewes bind us as well as they did them in all things which belong to the substance of the Covenant, and were not accidentall to them, that it inferres an obligatiōn to all the Mosaicall ceremonies, and consequently Judaisme; yet Mr Marshall would not think it equall I should charge him with Judaisme, and then make a declamation against him as turned Jew, and preaching Judaisme, and to be abandoned by Christians as going about to make them Jewes. Why then doth Mr Marshall deale so with others? I know Mr. Marshall pag. 198. of his defence, endeavours to justifie his principle: he tells me, that his meaning never was to assert the practise of the rituall part in the least particle, but that there is a generall nature, end and use in which they doe agree; which is to answer just nothing. For the question was concerning the commands of the Jewes whither they bind, and particularly whither the command of circumcising infantes bind us virtually; now all the commands are about the practise of the rituals, and if they bind they are still in force; the generall nature is contained in the definition, which is *eterna veritatis*, and expressed in an enunciation, and is not commanded but declared, and so is the generall end and use to be known and belieaved, not to be practised; but commands are *orationes non enunciative*, never of the generall nature, but of particular acts. Who did ever talke of a command that a man should be *animal rationale*, or of a Sacrament that it should be a Seale of the Covenant? 2. Mr Marshall tells us he did not compare the Anabaptists and Hazael's intentions, but the fruit of their principles. The truth is, Mr Marshall did not compare their intentions, nor the fruit of their principles, with Hazael's act; but their bloudy sentence with his act. As for casting one of the Covenant of Grace, indeed and before God, no promise or error of ours can doe it, were our intentions

An Apologie for the two Treatises

tentions never so malicious, the malice of men cannot nullifie the faith of God. As for casting out in their sentence, I conceive it suspends any judgement of them; we can neither say they are in or out: yea, I say again if all be examined, Mr Marshall puts them as much out as we, unless Mr Marshall understand no more by the Covenant of Grace then Baptisme, which though Mr Marshall may doe in a popular auditory, which cannot discern between chalke and cheele, yet me thinks he should forbear to doe it in priest, in a treatise dedicated to the Assembly of Divines. But I wonder the lesse at Mr Marshall's rashnesse in accusing the Anabaptists, when he is not ashamed to tell me thus, pag. 238. of his defence. *It is your judgement that all infants, even of beleevers as well as Pagans, though they may potentially belong to the Kingdome of Christ, yet actually they belong to the Kingdome of the Devil;* which I am sure he no where findes in my writings, but to the contrary in divers passages, as exercit. pag. 24. But saith Mr Marshall, you acknowledge no more promise for the children of beleevers, then for the children of Turks. This matter I had disputed at large, part. 2. §. 10 of my Examen, and to mitigate the odium which popular preachers cast on us by this Allegation I had said, *so doth the opinion of Cyprian with his 66 Bishops that would have Gods grace denied to none;* and therefore his opinion puts all the infants of beleevers in the same condition with Turks children. To this saith Mr Marshall pag. 85. of his defence, which I have shewed, will not follow out of the words of the Epistl. Now that I conceive he means he had formerly shewed is. I pag. 141 in these words, though he layes it downe in general terms, that none are to be hindred from comming to Christ: yet what he saies ought to be understood of the Church, because he speakes of such as God hath cleansed or purified, who were common: which passage I should foorne have expected from a Jesuit then Mr Marshall to say that Cyprian ought to be understood of the Church, when he words *nulli hominum nato misericordiam Dei & gratiam denerandam, & nulla anima perdenda est;* are as expresse as may be, that he means it of any that are born of mankind, that the grace of God is not to be denied them. And after, *omne in omnino bonum et gratiam Christi admittendum esse,* and the reason he useth is not from a clea-

. Deo

63

concerning Infant-Baptism,

Deo semel facti sunt, as he that reades the Epistle, will pre-
ty perceive. I alledged also the words of the Grave damnation of
the Brownists published by Mr Rabbard, to shew not that which
Mr Marshall it seems intended, which was to charge all the Ana-
daptists of putting all the children of believers out of the Cove-
nant of Grace as the Turks children, but to shew that the opinion
of paedobaptisme, as some assert it, doth put all the infants of be-
lievers into the selfe-same condition with the infants of Turkes and
Indians (which were Mr Marshall's words) by putting all of them
alike into the Covenant of Grace. For if they may be lawfully ac-
counted within Gods Covenant, if any of their Ancestors in any ge-
neration were faithful, and that because of Gods promise, Exod.
20. 5. then the children of Turks are lawfully accounted within
the Covenant, yea all the infants in the world, for it is not beyond
the thousandth generation to Noah. Mr Marshall tells me that he
supposeth I do not think those words, Exod 20. 5. were intended so thin-
kite that all the children in the world, who came from Adam or
Noah were included in the Covenant of Grace, nor that I believe Mr
Rabbard thought so. What Mr Rab. thought I know not but his
words import so much, and if that was not intended, the text was
impertinently alleged; and though it is true I do not think with
them, yet I might fitly allege their words which I approve not,
to shew this is no such absurdity, which Mr Marshall called a
great mischief, that by the Anti-paedobaptists opinion, all the
children of believers should be put into the same condition with the
children of Turkes; sith the same followes on the Paedobaptists
doctrine also. I had also Examen, part. 2. S. 10. set down my
opinion freely in 4 Propositions about the parity of condition of
the Turks and our infants, and told Mr Marshall thus possibly if you
open your selfe plainly, there will be no difference between us. Mr
Marshall in his Defence neither plainly opens himselfe, wherein
he puts the difference, nor sets down my answere justly, but leaves
out wholly the the fourth Proposition, or confounds it with the
third; and other wise trangles and alters my words in his abridge-
ment, that they are much unlike what I delivered. For in-
stance, pag. 85. he sets down this for my second proposition.
That I know no more promise for believers children, then
for the children of unbelievers whereas my words are these.

For

An Apologie for the two Treatises

For the Covenant or Promise of Grace, that is righteousness and life in Christ, though I acknowledge a peculiar promise to Abrahams naturall posterity mentioned, Rom. 11. 27. yet I know not that God hath made such a Covenant to any, much lesse to all the naturall believing seed of any believing Gentile; and Propt. 3. I say, they have some promises, though generall indefinite and conditionall. And I mean by generall and indefinite, such as determine not the kind of good promised, nor the particular person; and therefore are true, if performed to any persons in any sort of good: and conditionall upon condition of faith and obedience, as, when it is said *the generation of the righteous shall be blessed, his righteousness to childrens children, to such as keep his Covenant.* Ps. 103. 17. 18. Ps. 112. 2. &c. I tell Mr Marshall if he can shew any more promises then I doe, I shall count them a treasure; if not, why doth he endeavour to make me and my opinion odious to the people, as if I put all the children of the whole Church out of the Covenant of Grace, as I doe the children of the Turkes; and acknowledge no more promise for the one, then for the other: whereas when he hath said as much as he can for them, he can bring no more promise for them then I doe, nor dares reject the limitations I restraine them by?

But sayes Mr Marshall, you leave them to have their actuall standing in the visible kingdome of the Devill. I ask whither the children have actuall standing in the visible kingdome of the Devill afore they are baptized or not? If he say they have not, then by not baptizing, I leave them not in the visible kingdome of the Devill; they are out of the visible kingdome of the Devill, though they be not baptized: if he say they have their actuall standing in the visible kingdome of the Devill afore they are baptized, then how is it true which the Protestants disputing against Bellarmin allage against the necessity of baptizing infants to salvation, that the chilidren of believers are holy afore baptism. The truth is, I neither leave infants in the Devills, nor Gods visible kingdome: for I conceive they are in neither kingdom visibly till they declare by their profession to whom they belong visibly. Mr Marshall used often this expression of belonging to the visible kingdoms of the Devill, and I told him Examen pag. 41. I feared he did it ad faciendum populum to move the people, by affrighting them by a bug-beare

concerning Infant-Baptisme.

65

beare word, if they keep their children from baptisme, then they leave them to have an actuall standing in the visible kingdome of the Devill, or to please them by making them beleieve that by baptisme their children are put out of the visible kingdome of the Devill. This I said not judging his heart, but being jealous least it was so; and I confess I am still suspiciois he doth so, because he still useth it after he hath beentold it, and it is a meer engine to stirre popular affections. For how bath the unbaptized infant an actuall standing in the visible kingdome of the Devill; unlesse it be true that all unbaptized persons have an actuall standing in the visible kingdome of the Devill, which is false in the *Catechumeni* of old, the converted theefe on the Croffe, Constantine the Great, and many others who were in the visible kingdom of the Christ afore they were baptized. On the other side, thousands of people in *America* baptized by the *Spaniards*, had as visible standing in the Devills kingdome as before. I confess when the baptized professeth the faith of Christ, then baptisme is a note of a visible member, and a *distinguishing badge between the people of God and the Devill*, and so by baptisme a perlon is exhibited a member of the Church, but otherwise I see no reason why an infant that makes no profession of Christ, should be counted after baptisme a visible member of the Church more then before. Let a child of a Christian be baptized, and after being an infant, and taken by a Turke, be circumciled, wherein is that child more a visible member of the Church of Christ then a Turkes child, or is hee not rather a member of the Church of Mahomet, then of Christ? Are the *Janizaries* any whit the more Christians because they were baptized infants of Christian Greekes? Protestant writers are wont to define the visible Church of Christians a *number of persons that profess the faith of Christ*. So Art. 19. of the Church of England, and all sorts of Protestant writers. Now that which makes the visible Church, makes each member a visible member, and that is profession. Baptisme and the Lords Supper; and hearing, are notes as they signify profession, otherwise if a person be baptized, if he should heare or receive the Lords Supper, and did not profess the faith, he should not be a visible member for all that. I confess I have met with some writings which put Baptisme into the definition of the Church, as necessary to the being

An Apologie for the two Treatises

of a visible Church, and the words in the *Confession of Faith of the 7 Churches of Anabaptists about London* [being baptized into that faith] Artic. 33. are somewhat doubtfull, though they seem rather to import that Baptisme is necessary to the right order of a Christian Church, then to the being of a Church; and I confess they that hold that members are added to the Church by Baptisme and not otherwise, and hold a nullity of Pædo baptisme, must needs say the Churches that have no other then Infant-Baptisme, are no true Churches; nor their members Church-members, as Master *Marshall* layes pag. 84. of his *Defence*; and so voluntary separation necessary. But these points of the necessity of right Baptisme, not onely to the right order, but also to the being of a visible Church and Church-member, and so voluntary separation barely for the defect of it, I have ever disclaimed; as considering the many errors and ill consequences that would follow thereupon, and though provocations still increase, yet I have in my practise shunned separation from my dissenting brethren, and I presume though Mr *Marshall* count right Baptisme a necessary duty, yet he will be more advised then to make it essentiall, either *constitutive* or *consecutivè* to the being of a Church or Christian either visible or invisible, for feare of giving too much advantage to Separatists, and Seekers. I suppose in reference to the present point this is the truth, that however every infant is either in the invisible kingdome of God or Satan, that is, elect or reprobate; yet no child till hee make profession doth visibly belong either to the one, or to the other. I acknowledge that in the visible Church of the *Jewes*, the infants were reckoned to the Church, and the reason was from the peculiar Church-state of the *Jewes*. For then God took the whole family of *Abram* together in one day, and after the whole nation of the *Jewes*, were but one Church or congregation: *Act 7. 28.* and accordingly appointed one Tabernacle and Altar, and one high Priest, and tolemne seats for all to meet at, and one nation on alitadge, circumcision; and hee erected them into one policy; because he would have one fixed people among, and from whom the *Messiah* should come; and therefore he so provided, that their tribes shoulde be distinguished, their inheritancee divided, and many more such things, which he did not certain when or since, ap-

point to any other people. And this Church-state Circumcision was applied to, so that if Master Marshall and Master Geree will conclude from Rom. 11. 17. &c. that we must have our children baptized, because they had theirs circumcized, we being ingrafted into their room, they must not only prove that the Gentile-beleevers are grafted into the invisible Church in place of the Jewes (which is the Apostles sense there notwithstanding, that which M. Geree, or Master Marshall have laid) nor that the Gentile visible Churches are grafted into the visible Church in the place of the Jewes: but they must also prove that the Gentiles are taken into the same outward Church state which the Jewes had. But that is most false. For now God gathers not a whole nation together, nor hath appointed one Temple Altar, Priest, &c. as he did to the Jewes: but he gathers now by preaching, some here, some there, and the visible Church hath now no such policy or outward government as the Jewes had then: and therefore there is not the same reason of infants belonging to the visible Church of the Gentiles as they did to the Jewes, except one can prove that we are to have the same outward face and constitution of the Church which they had, which Papists and others imagining have corrupted the Church, and baptizing of infants ariseth out of the same Jewish conceit.

Master Marshall had alleaged in his Sermon Rom. 11.16. &c. to prove his second conclusion. I complained in my Examen of the obscurity of his inference, shewed him how ambiguous his words were. He takes this as it it were done in scorne, and as an artifice to darken an argument, but doth not mend the matter in his Defence. For 1. pag. 134. whereas I distinguished of grafting in, that *it may be either by faith, or profession of faith; or by some outward Ordinance*: Master Marshall in the repetition leaves out this last member, which is not right dealing. 2. Whereas I had said: *The thing that is to be proved is, that all the infants of every believer are in the Covenant of free Grace in Christ, and by virtue thereof to be baptised.* Master Marshall pag. 135. of his Defence denies this, though it seemed plaine to me, that this text was brought to prove his second conclusion, which I took to bee the same with the antecedent of his Enthymeme, or first argument; and that I did conceive had this sense, that all the infants of every

A large dis-
q uisition of
R m. 11.17.
&c. wherein is
shewed that
the ingrafting
there is into
the invisible
Church by e-
lection and
giving faith,
and that it
proves not In-
fant-baptisme.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

beleever are in the Covenant of free Grace in Christ, otherwise his first argument is but nugatory, the antecedent and conclusion being the same; and he equivocates in his two first conclusions, understanding the first conclusion of the covenant of saving Grace in Christ, the other of the outward Covenant as hee calls it, as I shewed above: which serves for no better end then to delude a reader. But pag. 135. he saith thus; *The thing to be proved from this text is, that our infants have the same right which the infants of the Jewes had, pag. 140.* *The thing to be proved was, our infants have the same priviledge with theirs;* yet in the same page he thus formeth the conclusion, *and therefore we and they making up the same body are taken in upon the same ground, our children with us, as well as theirs with them:* which last conclusion I do not take to be the same with the former, nor any one of them the same, with the other or with the antecedent of Mr Mar. second arguinent, or his second conclusion, 3. It is yet uncertain to me what is the medium he would prove his conclusion by out of that text. In his Defence in three places he calls his confus'd heap of Dictates his argument, to wit, pag. 135. *The Ap'stles scope was to shew that we Gentiles have now the same grafting into the true olive which the Jewes formerly had; and our present grafting in is answerable to their present casting out, and their taking in at the latter end of the world, shall be the same grafting [though more gloriously] as ours is now; and it is apparent that at their first taking in, they and their children were taken in, at their casting out they and their children were broken off; and when they shall be taken in againe at the end of the world, they and their children shall be taken in together, and all by vertue of the Covenant, Ego Deus tuus, &c.* which is the same to us, and to them; we and they making up the Church of God. In the same page in these words. *Looke how the Jewes children were grafted in, so are our children, we are taken instead of them who were cast out, and becom on visible Kingdom of Chr st with the rest of them who kept their stat.on, pag. 140.* We as they, were taken in; they and their children shall be at the last taken in again, as they were at the first: and therefore we and they making up the same body, are taken in upon the same ground, our children with us, as well as theirs with them. Which though hee calls his argument, and layes it hath a plaine sense, yet I see so many

many ambiguities still in his words, his speeches so informe or shapelesse, that I know not well whither he would make many syllogismes or one, nor which to call the major, which the minor Proposition or terme, or which the medium; and I must professe I find Mr *Marshall* still so confused a disputer, that I know not to what purpose his manner of writing in this point should tend, but to puzzle his reader, and weary his respondent. And sith he was told of this, p. 56. of my *Examen*, and desired to mend it in his next writing; yet in stead of mending it, he puts it off lightly, pag. 125. of his *D-fence*, a person may suspect it is done on purpose to puzzle, rather then to satisfy. For why should a man that would clear truth in a point of dispute, though in a Sermon *ad populum*; especially when his auditory is such as it was at Westminster Abby, be unwilling to make a syllogisme in mood and figure? did not *Master Marshall* make sundry syllogismes in the same Sermon? And would not a short syllogisme after a distinct short paraphrase, have better cleared the truth then such a confused heap of words he useth in his alleaging, *Rom. 11.16. &c.* And *Acts 2. 39*. However what reason or excuse he can pretend for not doing it in his *Defence*, I see not.

Mr Geree in his *vindicia Pado-baptismi*, ch. 1. sect. 3. goes somewhat more distinctly to work, yet neither doth he frame a syllogisme from *Roms. 11.11. 12. 13. 17. 18. &c.* nor doe I know how he would have it framed. He saith, *the conclusion to be proved is, that the children of Christians have the same priviledge with children of Jewes, as they were comprehended so under the Covenant with their parents as to be reputed members of the same visible kingdome, and to be sealed with them.* This conclusion I deny if it be understood of the outward priviledge belonging to the Jewish Church in that state it was afore Christ's comming. To prove it he layes down four Propositions, and deduceth four conjectaries, but how he shews not. The third is ambiguous, and if he mean by [into the place of the Jewes cut off] the same Church-state, and by [partaking of their priviledges] the priviledges belonging to their Church-state as I think he doth, it is to denied, and so likewise his seconde and third conjectary in that lense. Nor doth either *Rom. 11.17.* prove it as shall be presently shewed, nor is a believing Jew a looser by the coming of Christ in regard of his

70

A Apologie for the two Treatises

seed, sith this was a peculiar priviledge in the time of that Church state, which now ceaseth to be a priviledge, Christ being come; as in like manner the Temple, High Priest, &c. doe, which I have more largely discussted *Examen*, part. 3. §. 1. And for the fourth conjectary, if it be understood of pristine Church-state, I likewise deny it. I grant *the promise will bee extended to them and their seed*, but how? Not by an outward ordinance or initiall scale, as it is called, applyed to infants, but by the communicating *the spirit and word of God to them and their seed*; as the text he allegeth imports, *Isai. 59.20*. Nor by holding that neither Jewes nor Gentiles now are to have their infants sealed wil follow, *that there will be two distinct states in the Christian Churches: one of the Jews holy Fathers and children, another of the Gentiles who have only personall priviledges, none for their seed*; for neither doth Baptisme belong to the one or the other, because they the are seed of beleevers: and for regeneration and laying benefits, the Lord bestowes to the seed of either as pleafeth him. Nor would this conceit of mine *set up or keep up a partition wall still contrary to the Apostle, Ephes. 2. 14*. For then a partition wall is kept up when the Gentiles as Gentiles are excluded from accessie to God, which is not done by my doctrine, they that hold that the command about Circumcision still binds virtually, come nearer to the setting up a partition wall in the Apostles ier se. I return to Mr Marshall.

Mr Marshall in his Sermon as I conceived made this the thing he would prove, *that we and our children are graffed in together*; this I granted in some leste to be true, that God doth usually call and adopt the children with the Fathers, but I denied it to be so perpetually; so as that a rule for an outward ordinance may be framed thence. And so farre as I can collect the chiefe meaum Master Marshall and Master Geree take hence to prove it is, *that we Gentiles have the same ingraffing into the true olive which the Jewes formerly had*. This Master Marshall made the Apostles scope, though the truth is it is so farre from being the Apostles scope, that it agrees not with his words, who makes the ancient Jewes naturall branches, not ingraffed, and the scope of the Apostle is otherwise, as hath been shewed: *Examen*, pag. 65. But the chiefe difference is about the ingraffing what that is, as I had said, *The ingraffing to me is meant of the invisible Church by election* and

concerning Infant-Baptisme,

71

and faith. To this Master Marshall pag. 136. sayes, I reply, if it be meant of the invisible Church only, and that all who are ingrafted in the Apostles sense whether Jews or Gentiles are only elect ones, I will promise you never to plead this Scripture more for any infants; and after if you please let us try it on.

I agree to this motion, and determine, that the grafting in Rom. 11. 17. &c. is meant of the ingrafting into the invisible Church by election and giving faith, with this caution; that I doe not deny that the same people might or were ingrafted into the visible Church by profession of faith, and baptism; but hold that this ingrafting is more then that which is into the visible Church by outward profession and ordinances. To prove my determination, I thus argue.

1. That ingrafting which is Gods act by his sole power, is into the invisible Church by election and giving faith. For grafting into the invisible Church is as Mr Marshall saith, pag. 135: admission in o visible membership, which if it be by an outward ordinance, is the easie act of the administratour; if by profession of faith, the easie act of the professor. But the ingrafting meant Rom. 11. is Gods act from his sole power, as is proved from verse 23. where the reason is rendred why the Jewes should be again grafted in, is, because God is able to graffe them in again; Ergo, the grafting here is into the invisible Church.

2. That ingrafting which is called reconciliation opposite to casting away, that is by election and giving faith; for no other acts can reconcile: but the ingrafting here is called reconciliation opposite to casting away. v. 25: as may appeare in that v. 16. is a reason of the clatne about the reception of the Jewes, v. 15. and the 17 verse, is an admonition from the supposition, v. 15. that the Jewes were cast away; which is called breaking off, v. 17. now if breaking off, v. 17. be the same with casting away, v. 15. then ingrafting is the same with reconciliation; Ergo, ingrafting is by election and giving of faith.

3. The ingrafting must bee meant of that act whereby the branch stand in the tree as a branch: this will none deny, it being the very terminus of ingrafting; as heat the terminus of Calectacion. But that is by giving faith. Ergo, The minor is proved from v. 20. where it is laid, by unbelief they were broken off, but
thou

An Apologie for the two Treatises

72

thou standest by faith, whence I argue. That act whereby the branch stands in the tree as a branch, must be the giving that meanes whereby the branch thus stands, but that is faith, v. 20. Ergo, the act of ingrafting is by giving of faith.

4. That ingrafting is meant v. 17. whereby the *wild olive is Copartaker of the root and farnesse of the olive tree*, as is asserted there. But such is only election and giving of faith. Ergo, The minor I prove by considering who the root is, and what the farnesse of the olive tree is. 1. Negatively, the root is not as Master Marshall and Master Blake, every believing parent. For then all the branches should be naturall; the child of every believing parent is a naturall branch from his father: but here the Apostle makes the Gentiles branches, and a wild olive grafted in besides nature, and the Jewes only natural branches growing from the root, v. 21. 24. Nor is it of any moment which is objected, that other parents are called roots as Jesse, Itai. 11. 1. For here only the root notes such a Father as is holy, and from whom the branches are holy; which agrees not to every believing Father. 2. Positively. The root is no other then Abraham. I said twice in my Examen, pag. 68. 129. *Abraham only is a holy root, or at most Abraham Isaac and Jacob*; which I said only by concession: that if it were so, yet every godly parent was not a holy root, and therefore it served my turn there, if it were so. This Mr Marshall pag. 134. calls; saying, and unsaying. But Mr Marshall might have considered that I did in that addition only mention the judgement of others, and not contradicted it there where it was not against my purpose if it were granted; but otherwise, where I expresse my owne judgement, I mention only Abraham as the root, Exercit. pag. 10. Examen, pag. 64, 65. And soe doe Deodat annot. on v. 16, 17. The new Annot. on v. 16. Beza on v. 17. *Neque dubium est, quin radicis nomine intelligatur, Abraham credentium pater.* Which contains the reason of this opinion. For he must be the root who is a Father both to Jewes and Gentiles, who are also branches in this root, the root is said to beare them, v. 18. But we read not this of any other then of Abraham called the Father of the faithfull. Rom. 4. 11. and the Gentile believers his seed, Rom. 4. 13. 16. Gal. 3. 29. no where are these things said of Isaac, and Jacob. It is said indeed that the Jewes are belov'd,

ved them, for the Fathers either because of the Covenant made with them, or because of the favour God bare them ; as often he is said to reserve a lamp in *Judah* for *Davids* sake, but this speech hath speciall respect to the Jewes, whereas the benefit of the root, v. 17. 18. is common to Gentiles and Jews. As for the fatnesse of the olive tree *Deodatus* saith truly, it is the blessing and promise made to *Abraham* & his seed & to the Apostle expresteth it, *Gal. 3. 14.* And it would be too frigid, and washy an exposition to expound it of outward priviledges, & ordinances. Yea it were false, for the Gentiles were not partaker of the outward priviledges and ordinances of *Abraham* and the Jewes they being taken away. Now these things being put it multneeds be, that this ingrafting must be by giving faith, sith by faith only the Gentiles are partakers of the root *Abraham*, and the fatnesse of the olive tree the believeng Church, not by naturall generation of believeng parents, nor by outward administrations. Ergo, the ingrafting here into the invisible Church is by election and giving of faith.

5. From verse 25. If the breaking off the Jewes be by blinding, then the ingrafting is by giving faith, but the former is true, verse 25. Ergo, the latter.

6. If reingrafting of the Jewes produceth salvation, is by turning them from iniquity, taking away their sins according to Gods Covenant, then it is into the invisible Church by giving faith, but the former is true, verse 26, 27. Ergo, the latter.

7. If the reingrafting be by vertue of Gods election and love, his gifts of calling then it is into the invisible Church by election and giving faith, but the former is true & 28, 29. Ergo, the latter.

8. If the ingrafting both of Jewes and Gentiles be the fruit of gods mercy, the breaking off by shutting up in unbelieve, then the ingrafting is into the invisible Church by election and giving faith, but the former is true, verse 30, 31, 32. Ergo, the latter.

What should I say more? It is so plaine from the whole seope and tenour of the Apostles words, that the ingrafting there spoken of is into the invisible Church by election and giving faith, that from the first verte of the chapter to verte 13. there is scarce a verte but speaks of rejecting, foreknowing, election, grace, hardning, giving a spirit of slumber, darkning the eyes, stumbling, falling or some equipollent terms to these, and the Apostle doth

An Apologie for the two Treatises

74

plainly signify his intention in all that discourse to be the shewing the mystery of Gods counsell in electing, reprobating, blinding, converting one while the Jewes, another while the Gentiles; so that I cannot but admire, that Mr Marshall should interpret the ingrafting of bare admission into visible Church-membership.

9. Adde hereto. The places which I conceive answer to Rom. 11. 17. must be understood of the invisible Church as Eph. 3. 6. 1 Cor. 12. 13. Gal. 3. 14. 26. 28. 29. Lastly for testimonies of interpreters I find but two in Marlorats Cathol. Exposition on Rom. 11. 17. and they have these words. Hyperius. *Neque enim hic amplius docet, sed orationem totam ad Gentes convertens sapienter monet, ne propter electionem suam efferantur, aut Iudaos quia rejecti sunt contemnant: maxime quum & Iudaorum plurimi salutem sint adhuc per Evangelium consequunturi, Gentes vero iterum possent, si Deo ita visum foret reprobari.* Bucer. *Institus fuisti illis Hoc beneficium est quod Genibus per Iudeos contigit. Genes enim per fidem Christi facta sunt semen Abrahæ Gal. 3. 29.* Ergo, *institi Iudeis, ut gratia sanctis patribus promissa, & fruantur, & spiritu illorum vivant: id quod Apostolus per communionem radicis & pinguedinis significat. ut namque filii Dei omnes eadem Dei benevolentia vituntur, ita eorum spiritu aguntur, etiam si hic donetur grandior post revelatum Christum.* Hic vero ex precipuis locis est ex quibus probatur eodem spiritu vera justitia donatos fuisse Iudeos ante incarnatum Christum. Calvin ad vers. 20. nam creatio Iudaorum, si ob incredulitatem facta est, Gentium institio per fidem, quid restat nisi ut Dei gratiam recognoscendo inde ad modestiam ac submissionem formentur. And this I thought so plain, that I conceived Mr Marshall himself so expounded it in his sermon pag. 43. in these words. *It being the primary intention of the Covenant of Grace, in it's first work, to shew what free grace can and will doe to miserable nothing, to cut miserable man off from the wild olive, and graffe him into the true olive, to take away the heart of stone, to create in them a heart of flesh, &c.* which thing hee saith nothing to in his Defence, though I alleaged it pag. 64. of my Examen, except it be that he meant the words he useth pag. 137 of his Defence, alleging that I say, *institio* (not *incision* as it is printed in Mr Marshalls Defence) may be either into the visible or invisible Church, grafting in, may be either by faith or by profession of faith;

faith, and therefore I say the same with him, should be to tell me that he can bring as much from my words for him as I bring from his words for me, which conceit is but vain; for my words are nothing but the opening the distinction of the various kind of ingrafting; no assertion in those words what institution is meant, *Rom. 11. 17.* and for the words Mr Marshall alleageth out of my *Examen*, pag. 65. of which he saith. *And truly Sir, in these words to my understanding, you grant not only my interpretation of this place, but even the question controverted betwixt us.* I shall shew to be a mistake in answering his objection against the interpretation I give of the ingrafting into the invisible Church, having first observed that Master Gerees words in his *vindic. pædob. pt smi* confirme my interpretation against his owne in the Chapter next before, when he saith, *Chap. 1. Sect. 4. pag. 19.* *The holines there is meant not actuall holiness, but potentiall in regard of Gods election.* And Mr Blake, pag. 94. we by faith are grafted in for them, *Rom. 20.* The onely objection of waight is, that then some branches of the invisible Church may be broken off, and so election made revocable, and Apostasy from grace maintained: and hereupon Mr Marshall accuseth me as symbolizing with *Arminius*, and puts this in the margine of his book, pag. 144. and in the *Index*: and thereby thinks to cut scores with me for accusing him as symbolizing with *Arminius*, pag. 69. of my *Examen*.

To which I answer. 1. That there is a wide difference between Mr Marshals case and mine. I shew that Mr Marshals tenet agrees with *Arminius* his tenet, and I quote *Arminius* his words in the margine; and therein I did justly. For *Arminius* also understood his speech of outward administrations, to wit the preaching of the Gospell, in the end of his *Anti-perkins*, and both Mr Marshall and *Arminius* agree, that the infants of the wicked for these outward dispensations are comprehended in their parents according to the tenour of Gods justice. But I expressly rejected the tenet of *Arminius* about revocable election, and Apostasy from grace; which if they should follow from my interpretation, I conceiving otherwise, yet were not I to be charged with symbolizing with *Arminius*, as Mr Marshall doth in his professed tenet. 2. But I conceived I had prevented this objection, pag. 64. of my *Examen*, at those words. The meaning is not that *some* of the

An Apologie for the two Treatises

76

branches in the invisible Church may be broken off; but only such as were so in appearance; and I alledged John 15.2: as an instance of the like expreſſion: shewing in that very similitude, that the word branch in Christ is ſometimes meant of that which is ſo in appearance, & ſometimes of that which is ſo in truth; and ſo in like manner it may be uſed, Rom. 11.17. And thus Chamier, tom. 3. paſtrat. Cathol. l. 13. c. 21. anſwers Bellarmin; urging John. 15. 2. for falling away from faith. But Mr Marshall tells me, I professe I understand not how this diſtincſion gives you the leaſt help. I reply, that it plainly avoyds the conſequence objected againſt my interpretation; for though the branches in one paſſage be meant of the branches in appearance, and the breaking off that which was ſo in appearance, yet other places, as in the fame verfe in the ingrafting may be meant of true ingrafting into the invisible Church in like manner, as it is John 15. 2. But because upon more accurate examination I conceiue that is not the genuine anſwer, I ſhall therefore let it paſſe. 3. I ſay, when the Apostle faith the branches were broken off, he meanes it of the branches that were truly ſuch, and of the ingrafting that was truly ſuch into the invisible Church, but that by the branches are not meant ſingular persons; but the people, or as M. Mar. ſpeaks p. 137. *the body of them were the branches ſpoken of in this place,* & M Geree p. 16. Nor is it either the Arminians tenet, or any errore to ſay that the body of a people which were once the elect people of God, and ingraffed into the invisible Church, because the generality or a greater number were ſuch among that people, are broken off from election, and the invisible Church. For a people or nation is not a conſiſtent being, but a fluent being as a river, which is the ſame river ſtill, though not the ſame water; and therefore as when Cyrus turned Euphrates from it's own channell, hee may bee ſaid to have turned away the ſame river Euphrates that was created at firſt though it were not the ſame numericall water; ſo when God rejected the Jews from being his elect, beleeving people he broke off the ſame people that were the true branches of Abraham the true root in the invisible Church, and yet no one particular person, who was elect or in the invisible Church by faith broken off, which is the Arminian doctrine. And this I find obſerved by each of the three Authors alledged before from Marlorat. Hyperius at v. 21. is thus alledged;

alleged; speaking. *Quemadmodum nunc rejectus est populus Iudaicus, qui tamen electus fuerat: ita potest adhuc fieri, ut aliquando rejiciatur populus Gentilis, qui nunc electus est; alioquin singulos electos de populo Iudaico, vel de populo Gentili reprobari impossibile planè est. Ad hunc (inquam) modum si quicquid de ruina metuenda electis sequitur, non de singulis electis, sed de populo ex quo descendunt interpreteris, multis te molestiis liberaveris.* Calvin ad verle 21. precipue vero notandum Pauli sermonem non tam ad singulos homines, quam ad totum Gentium corpus dirigunt. Bæcer ad verle 22. *De Gentibus loquitur universim non de singulis hominibus.* And indeed the text leads me to this interpretation. For when it is said, verse 23, 24. *that they shall be grafted in,* God is able to graffe them in again; these which are according to nature; shall be graffed in their own olive; which cannot be understood of the same person, but of the same people.

Thus have I besides my first purpose put into this *Apology* this large dissertation about Rom. 11. 16, 17. &c. partly because by Mr Gerees conference with me and another, and his words to me; *Vindic. padobap. pag. 17. I commend this Scripture to your serious consideration, for I conceive it gives clear evidence to what I affirm;* I perceive this text is his chiefe hold for Infant-baptism, and in Mr Blakes new answer to my *Examen*, pag. 69. I find these words; *your examination, Rom. 11. 16. hath been under examination, and if there be strength in those exceptions, there is weakness nowhere.*

Mr Blake in his answer to my letter, pag. 30. saith thus. *If the ingrafting bee by saving faith onely, to derive saving grace personally inherent as a fruit of election from Abraham; then it must be that we are elect in Abraham, Abraham may say without me yee can doe nothing, &c.* I answer, if I made Abraham a root as communicating faith by infusion, or impetration mediatory as Christ, this would follow; but I make Abraham onely a root as he is called the Father of all them that beleeve, Rom. 4. 11. not by begetting faith in them, but as an exemplary cause of believing, as I gather from the expression. verse 12. that he is a Father to them that walk in the steps of our Father Abraham, which he had yet being uncircumcised.

Mr Blake ibid. pag. 31. what made Abraham, Isaac and Jacob

An Apologie for the two Treatises

roots (as in nature, so here, roots) but the Covenant? And was not the Covenant made as well with David, as with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. I answer, I make Abraham only the root, as he is only the Father of believers exemplarily, and that which made him the Father of believers was not the Covenant, but his exemplary faith, as I gather from the words of the Apostle, Rom. 4:16, 17, 18, 19-21. And this is all the accession of strength I find him opposing to my so manifest weakness. The rest is answered already.

S. 15.
of M. Marshals
unjust charge
against me as
darkning his
arguments..
and casting
it in the
face of the
Assembly.

Mr Marshall pag. 124. sayes, I raise a dust about his argument, because I tell him he doth not distinctly expresse what the promise is, *Acts* 2. 39. and I require of him to forme his proofes into an argument, as if it were unreasonable to require him to make a syllogisme in mood and figure in a Sermon. And yet hee did make diversc in that Sermon, as pag. 39, 41. But it seems neither then nor since is he willing to tell what promise that is, *Acts* 2. 39 and then conclude syllogistically; for then it would plainly appear that that text serves not his purpose, who in his second conclusion will *not affirme that the promise of saving grace is made to the natural seed of believers*; and yet that text speakes of the promise of Christ, and saving Grace by him. However I remember this was Doctor Prudentius his manner in Oxford, to require the disputant when he wylled a text to read it, and then to gather his argument from it, and this I over tooke to b. a bringing of light, and not raising a dust about his argument. And I shall still professse it to be a very iolome thing to me to answer an author that will not doe this, and till Mr Marshall do it, I shall censure him as one that takes people up to shew truth, but to darken it with multitude of words, so as no man that comes shall have much adoe to find the me-

rightly called by Logicians *Inveniatio*, and is the onely way to enlighten, not to darken speeches. And therefore all that are able in dispute, make this their chiefe busynesse to distinguish termes, or things that differ; and then set down their conclusions, and frame their arguments and answers, which is the thing I would have Mr Marshall doe : Nor is my pretending obscurity in Marshall a kind of art to evad what cannot plainly be answered, as Mr Geree conceives, *vind. paedobap. ch. 1. sect. 3.* but a means to find out the force of the argument, that I might give it a plain answer.

Whereas I had framed the fifth argument in my exrecitation thus. *That which in succeeding ages in which it was in use, was in force.* 1. *As a tradition not written.* 2. *Out of imitation of Jewish circumcision.* 3. *Without universall practise.* 4. *Together with the error of giving infants the Lords Supper, and many other humane inventions under the name of Apostolical traditions that is deservedly doubtfull, but such is Infant-Baptisme;* Ergo, Mr Marshall pag. 251. 252. tells me, *this is a poor argument.* And yet such arguments have been accounted after other arguments from Scripture of great moment against Papists and Prelates, in rejecting of ceremonys. But how doth Mr Mar. answer this? He denies the major, which hath been accounted good in other points. And then because I make a severall proove of the severall parts of the minor : he repeats my words as if I had made a severall argument from each branch, and to make a shew of their weakness, puts in another argument and conclusion then mine, as like, with this inference. Ergo, we are not bound to observe it, Ergo, it may not a duty, which were none of my conclusions. And then stylles This kind of arguing *as mad as* *as wild as* *that which the Schollars* *call a Tortoise an argument,* and the boyes in the schools would have *and will have* *said so* *informe.* I professe if I should lie, or be at re-
Psalms opportunity, I might as well say, *as* *as* *as* *that which the* *Schollars* *call a Tortoise an argument,* and the boyes in the schools would have *and will have* *said so* *informe.* I might as well say, *as* *as* *as* *that which the* *Schollars* *call a Tortoise an argument,* and the boyes in the schools would have *and will have* *said so* *informe.* I might as well say, *as* *as* *as* *that which the* *Schollars* *call a Tortoise an argument,* and the boyes in the schools would have *and will have* *said so* *informe.*

An Apologie for the two Treatises

cation is equivocating with him. But what a ridiculous charge is this? It's equivocation when a word is taken in various senses. Is it equivocation in me to take the word *covenant of grace* only of the covenant of saving grace? This is like as if a man should be charged with speaking nonsense, because he speakes good reason in right language.

But I hope by this time the Reader doth understand who hath used sophistry in disputing, I or Master Marshall.

What I said of the Assembly, pag. 27. of my Examen, I did it not so cast filth in their face, as Master Marshall construed it; but as a brotherly intimation of my feares and apprehensions to make them cautious, whose wife and faithfull deportment in that great trust reposed in them is of great moment to the whole Christian Church. Of whom I profess I am still jealous out of Love to them, that especially in this matter they are not so sensible as they should be of the truth of God, and the good of the Church. For which jealousie, and for what I said about wasting of time about inconsiderable things comparatively, I suppose I am able to give a sufficient account. And this I speake meerly to awaken them, and to prevent that inconsideratenes through an ~~excessive~~ passion, or such like cause usually befalls such meetings, and is the cause of much woe to the Church of God. Be it well or ill taken *liberavi animam meam meam*, I have freed my owne soule.

S 16. Of Mr Marshall's untrue charge against me, as it I rested on Grotius in setting down the tenent of Antiquity upon occasion of which the tenent of Antiquity is again examined, my judgment of their doctrine vindicated, Mr. Marshall's new allegations answered, and my diligence to find out their tenets manifested.

There are some other things wherewith Mr Marshall endeavours to render me a suspected person, pag. 29. of his defence. I cannot but wonder, why you (who pretend to be familiarly acquainted with the secrets of Antiquity) should have so much correspondence with them who are not likely to helpe you with any certain intelligence. Hugo Grotius is the strongest stake to support your tottering badge; and since I am Grotius was a friend to the Socinians, and it is well knowne what they think of Baptisme. To this I answer, it is untrue that I any where pretend to be familiarly acquainted with the secrets of Antiquity. I say, so farre as I can by search find it is thus and thus, but never did take upon me familiar acquaintance with the serets of Antiquity. It seemes Master Marshall had the helpe of his friend, and so there was a Colledge to answer my Booke, yet after he and his friend have done all they could in this point, it doth not yet appear but that I was in the right

right, to wit that *Infant baptisme* is not so ancient as is pretended. For he hath not yet acquitted the treatise of questions ad Orthodoxos from bastardy; nor hath he answered that which I laid that the words and whole scope of *Irenaeus*, lib. 2, c. 39. shew that the place is not meant of *Baptisme*: but with a new device, such as it concernes the authors conscience to looke to, when he is told the words and whole scope shew that the place is not meant of *Baptisme*; in which I chiefly alleged the words, the answerer saies nothing to that, but maimedly sets downe my words thus. In the last place you labour to prove that it is not meant of *Baptisme* from *Irenaeus* his scope in that place. And then sayes that though the scope be so, yet the words prove the question in debate before us. Which is a manifest abusing the reader, never answering the reaon I gave from the very words and whole scope, that they could not be understood of the rite of *Baptisme*. And for *Origen* all that is yet brought cannot acquit the passages alleged from suspicion of being supposititious, considering that *Origen* is taxed for *Pelagianizing*, whereas those words are point-blanke against them, which being observed by me, the answerer thought it wisedome to say nothing to it. And for the rest of the testimonies Master *Marshall* brought, I did confess *Nazianzen*, *Cyprian*, *Augustin*, *Hierom*, *Ambroſe* mention *Pædobaptisme*, but never upon Mr *Marshall's* ground federal holines, but upon a supposed necessity to save the *Infant* from perishing.

Master *Marshall* it seems rests much on *Augustines* words, that he saith. *Hoc Ecclesia semper habuit, semper tenuit, hoc a maiorum fide accepit, hoc usque in finem perseveranter custodit*; He puts it therefore in the Title, pag. 55. of his Defence, and pag. 9. quotes for these wordes *Augustin. Serm. 15. de verbis Apoll.* I have read over that Sermon tom. 10 of his workes againe and againe and find not those wordes there, nor any to that purpose, I have also read Sermon 14. *de verbis Apolloti*, which hath the title *de Baptismo parvolorum adversus Pelagianos*, and I find not there those words; onely these I find there. *Santus Cyprianus ejus quem in manus sumpsi antiquus Episcopus sedis hujus, quid senserit de Baptismo parvolorum, immo quid semper Ecclesiam sensisse monstraverit paululum accipio*, I deny not but that those wordes may be in *Augustine*, but if Master *Marshall* had given me more certain

An Apologie for the two Treatises

certaine direction where to find them, I might then perhaps have given a more direct answer. However for these reasons I conceive little cause to be moved with those words. First, because I find not that *Augustin* tooke it to be the tenet of the Church from any other ground, then the Epistle of *Cyprian*, 59. ad *Fidum*, concerning which he saith that *Cyprian* hath shewed how the Church hath alwayes held it, both in the words above cited tom. 10. Serm. 14. de *verbis Apost.* & tom. 7. lib. 2. de *peccat merito & remissione*. c. 5. &c. And yet he that reads that Epiltle of *Cyprian* shall find *Cyprian* onely declaring the determination of the Coun-cill of 66 Bishops there mentioned, but nothing of the Churches alwayes holding it. Secondly, The famous story of the likeli-hood of cheating *Augustine* and the rest of the African Bishops with a supposititious Canon of the *Nicen Council* by three Ro-man Bishops to confirme Appeals to *Rome* from *Africa* in the case of *Apianus* doth methinkes shew, that *Augustin* might eas-ily be mistaken about the tenet of the Church. Thirdly, The many speches in *Augustin*, as Epist. 118, and elsewhere, and o-thers of the Ancients, about Easter, Lent-fast, Episcopacy, infant Communion and other traditions which are not credited by Pro-testant, nor some of them by some Popish writers doe cleare him from arrogance, or impudence that should say there is no great reason to give so much credit to that large assertion of *Augustin* (if it be his) as Master *Marshal* and some others seem to give to it. Fourthly Those words of *Augustin* tom. 7. de *peccat: merito & remissione*, lib. 10. c. 34. Optime Puniri Christiani baptis-mam nibil aliud quam salutem & sacramentum corporis Christi nihil aliud quam vitam vocant. Unde nisi ex antiquitate existimo, ex Apostolica traditione, qua Ecclesia Christi infimum teneat prae-ter baptismum, & participationem Dominica mensa, non solum non ad regnum Dei sed nec ad salutem, & vitam eternam posse quenquam hominum pervenire, do methinkes evidenter that *An-gustin* sometimes called that the Churches tenet, which he ga-thered by conjecture from the practice of the African Christians knowne to him. But it will be said the Pelagians did not deny In-fant baptism to have been the practise of the Church. I answer, nor do I deny that it was in *Augustines* time the practise of the Latin and Greek Churches to baptize Infants in case of necessity,

but that it was so from the beginning, and alwayes in the Church we do not find the Pelagians yeelded, yet did they not perhaps question it, either because they were carried away with that erroneous rule that what they saw every where practised, and found not when it began to take that for an Apostolical tradition, or because of the tyranny of the present custome, which *Augustine* himselfe somewhere confesseth, that though he disliked, yet *liberius improbare non audeo*. But saith Master *Marshal* pag. 55. *I cannot but conceive it likely, that Augustines Ecclesia semper habuit, semper tenuit, should sway as much with the intelligent impartial Reader, as Master *Tombes* his non semper habuit, non semper tenuit I grant it should and much more, yet the Authorities, and reasons I bring should be f account sufficient to weigh downe Augustines testimony.*

I had said the determination mentioned by *Cyprian Epist. 59. ad Pidum*, as farre as I can by search find, is the spring head of *Infant baptisme*. Master *Blake* in his Answer to my letter, pag. 6. *I desire to know what colour of truth you can put upon those words.* I answer, the words are true without any colour put upon them, For I did not deny that I found *Infant baptisme* practised before, but that the determination of that council was the spring head, that is as *Examen*, pag. 16. the first determined rule, or *Canon*, by force of which it hath since continued in a stremme, and this is true.

Having formerly searched for *Augustines* words so often alleged for the practise of *Infant baptisme*, upon the publishing Master *Blakes* booke I found them, not as Master *Marshal* quotes it, *Serm. 15. de verbis Apostoli*, but as Master *Blake* cites it, *Ser. 10.* And upon reading of them, the thing that *Augustine* saith the Church alwayes had, held and keeps, seems not to me to be the practise of *Infant baptisme*, unlesse by consequence (which in matter of history is not so cleare a proove) but the doctrine of original sin in Infants, which *Pelagians* denied, not the practise of baptizing Infants. For the words immediately before are *nemo ergo vobis susurret doctrinas alienas*. And these words are onely a passage in a Sermon *ad populum*, in which usually there is not such exactnes, as in other workes; & among those sermons, which are not out of all question whether genuine. But that the Reader may

An Apologie for the two Treatises

may judge of this testimony, I wil set down the words as I find them.

Nullus hominum in ista qua ex Adam defluit massa mortaliuum, nullus omnino hominum non agrotus, nullus sine gratia Christi sanans. Quid de parvulis pueris, si ex Adam agrotus? nam et ipsi portantur ad Ecclesiam. Et si pedibus illuc currere non possunt, alienis pedibus currunt ut sanentur. Accommodat illis mater Ecclesia aliorum pedes ut veniant, aliorum cor ut credant, aliorum linguam ut faciantur; ut quoniam, quod agri sunt alio peccante pregravantur, sic cum hi sani sunt, alio processu confiente salventur. Nemo ergo vobis susurret doctrinas alienas. Hoc Ecclesia semper habuit, semper tenuit: hoc a majorum fide percepit: hoc usque in finem perseveranter custodit. Quoniam non est opus sanis medicus sed agrotanyibus. Quid necessarium ergo habuit Infans Christum, si non agrotat? si sanus est quare per eos qui eum diligunt medicum querit? Si quando portantur Infantes, dicuntur omnino nullum propaginis habere peccatum, & venire ad Christum: quare non eis dicitur in Ecclesia, qui eos opportant ad Ecclesiam. Auferte hinc innocentes istos non est opus sanis medicus, sed male habentibus: non venit Christus vocare justos sed peccatores? nunquam dictum est sed nec aliquando dicitur. Which last words shew that *Augustine* spake these things not as an *Historian* from good records, but as in popular Sermons is wont, out of conjecture from common practise in his time. Certainly the last words *Augustine* could deliver on no other ground: This testimony then hath a weake basis. And me thinkes the testimony of *Chamier pastrat*: *Cathol. tom. 4. lib. 5. c. 15. § 19.* Denique hunc morem quis non vider ejus temporis esse, cum vix millesimus quisque baptizatur non adulterus, & in Catechumenis diligenter exercitus might serve to ballance *Augustines* testimony inconsistent with so many likelihoods to the contrary. Which testimony of *Chamier Master Marshall* might have vouchsaf'd to have taken notice of, though it was but in the Margin of my Booke.

Nor hath *Master Marshall* or his friend yet it proved baptizing of Infants of believers, by reaon of federal holiness taught by the Ancients. *Master Geree* puts a passage of *Tertullian de anima*, cap. 39. *Ex seminis prarogativa procreari sanctos* in his frontispiece, and *Master Marshall* conceives me sick of it. I answ're, I blesse God no truth makes me sick, it would make me well to

See
VIII

see p^rædobaptisme proved either of Scripture, or primitive Antiquity. But for this testimony of *Tertullian* my stomacke was quickly eased of it, as finding not onely by reading, *Delacerda* his note on it, but also by considering the occasion and words going before that *ex seminis prærogativa* imports not federal holines, but holiness, by reason of the freedom from that unholiness in their procreation, which the infidels children had from the many grosse idolatrous superstitions, by which they were defiled, and as it were dedicated to the Devill. And I conceive *Hieromes* words to *Paulinus*, Epist. 153. cited by Master *Blake* in his answer to my letter, pag. 57. expounding thus *Tertullian*, *afferens sanctos dici fidelium filios, quod quasi candidati sunt fidei & nullis idololatria sordibus polluantur*, shew that in *Tertullian* the prærogative of seed, notes onely freedome from pollutions of Idolatry, at or before their birth, not covenanter holiness, and the word *candidatos fidei*, the same with *designatos sanctitatis* prove that they were holy in expectation, because in hope and intention believers, and so to be baptized. And though I find *Tertullian*s words somewhat obscure, as all his writings are; yet in that he calls them *designatos sanctitatis* (which seems to be meant of baptisme) not onely *ex seminis prærogativa*, but alio *ex institutionis disciplina*, which Master *Marshall* himselfe interprets of their education, pag. 73. of his defence, it seems plaine to me, that this place proves that *Tertullian* makes their Christian education the antecedent to the baptisme of beleevers children in his daies: and so this place makes against Master *Marshall*s tenet not for it.

It is true, the Ancients doe allusively call baptisme circumcision. as they do the *Lords Table the Altar, the Lords Supper the Sacrifice, the Presbyters Priests, the Deacons Levites*; nor do I deny that they say *circumcision was a type of baptisme*, (which Protestant writers grant not) and that they thereupon make baptism succeed circumcision, and they argue for baptizing of Infants from circumcision, this I granted in my *exercitation and Examen*. But yet I thinke neither Master *Marshall* nor his friend can shew that they argued thus, the Children of *Abraham* were circumcised by vertue of the Covenant, *I will be thy God and the God of thy seed*, therefore the children of beleevers onely are to be baptized by vertue of the Covenant. I find that they argued thus from circumcision,

An Apologie for the two Treatises

circumcision, circumcision was the remedy against originall sinne, and the male that is not circumcised, shall be cut off from his people, so Baptisme is the remedy of originall sin, and by reason of it, the unbaptiz'd infant dying, shall bee damned. But I thinke if Master Marshals friend could, he would have shewed that they argued from federall holiness of infants of beleeving parents, to the capacity of Baptisme; this I yet think is a late device, no elder then Zuinglius as I said in my *Examen*. And so my hedge is not yet tottering, but rather Mr Marshal's hedge, whereby bee feneeth Infant-Baptisme either from Antiquity or Scripture is already so broken down, that a mean Scholler may goe through it; and if any truth-searching Scholler bee satisfied by Mr Marshal's writing, it is to me an amazement. 2. As for that which he saith, that *Grotius* is the strongest stake in my hedge, meaning in point of antiquity, therein Master Marshall is much deceived. For, 1. the chiefe stake in my hedge in point of antiquity is the observation upon what ground the Ancients taught Infant-Baptisme, which was not Covenant-holines, but supposed necessity to save the child from perishing; and the supposed power that Baptisme hath to give grace, which I gathered from *Cyprian*, *Augustin*, and others, but do not remember that I received it from any but by my own observation. 2. My hedge was in some sort made in my *Exercitation* before I ever took notice of any thing in *Grotius* about p^robaptisme, which was about the time I began to frame my *Examen* upon occasion of Mr Thomas Goodwin his citing his annotation upon *Matth. 19. 14.* where *Grotius* is so farre from being a stake in my hedge, that Doctor Homes, pag. 146. saith, that for *Grotius* his own opinion it is clear and full for Infant-Baptisme upon that 19 of *Matthem v. 14.* and therefore I suppose his testimony is the lesse to be suspected in this matter. I confess that *Grotius* put me in mind of that of *Gregory Nazianzen*, which I find in the relation of his life, that though his Father were a Greeke Bishop, yet he remained unbaptized, till being sent to *Athens* to study; being at sea he was in danger of drowning: and being perplexed, that he was likely to dye being unbaptized; he resolved to be baptized when he came to shore. Mr Marshall askes how I prove his Father was a Christian when he was born? To this I answere, that I had thought Mr Marshall had not been ignorant, that this instance of *Gregory Nazianzen's*

Nazianzen's Father is brought by many Protestant writers against the Papists that deny marriage to the Clergy, to prove that then Bishops were married, and did use their wives. If Mr Marshall please, he may read what *Chamier panstrat: Cathol. tom. 3. lib. 10. c. 13. S. 10.* sayes of his father and mother.

I also found in *Grotius* the instance of *Chrysostome*, which I confess I took upon his word as wanting books and time to read so much as was necessary to examine the matter, *Grotius* not directing whence he had it. But if that instance do not hold, the instance of *Hierome* is plain, whom *Erasmus* in his life proves out of his own writings to have been born of Christian parents in *Pannonia*, yet was baptized at *Rome*, whither he was sent to be taught the learning of that age.

The testimony of the *Council of Neocasarea* I did not remember till *Grotius* put me in mind of it; but I trusted not to his quotation only, but found the same in *Osiander* his *Epit. Eccles. Hist. Cent. 4. lib. 1. c. 21.* at the year 311. with this note; *Non intelligo quid sibi posterior bisjus Canonis pars velit.* As for the words they are so plain, that Mr Marshall's evasions are but shifts. For though it be true that the *Canon* was only about children in the womb, yet the reason of their not baptizing, is not either because they were not yet born, or sureties could not undertake for them, but because in the confession in baptism, every one's free choice is shewed. Which plainly declares that *Council* held that none were to be baptized, but such as shewed their own free choice by confession. As for *Balsamon* and *Zonaras* it is true that I have not read them but taken their testimony from *Grotius*, because the testimony of the *Council of Neocasarea*, ancienter than the first *Nicene* was the thing alledged, *Balsamon* and *Zonaras* were only glossers; yet Mr Marshall sayes nothing to *Zonaras*, and what he brings in answer to *Balsamon's* glossie is nothing to the purpose. For neither did *Grotius* nor I say that *Balsamon* denied *Infant-Baptisme* according to his own opinion, but that from that canon *Balsamon* and *Zonaras*, do infer that an infant cannot be baptized because it hath not power to choose the confession of Divine Baptisme, which is all one with that which Mr Marshall himselfe faith, pag. 31. There is required of him that would profess himselfe a follower of Christ (*as Zonaras expounds the last words of the Canon*) a free election:

An Apologie for the two Treatises

or (as Balsamon hath it) there is required of everyone in Baptisme his own promise, which an infant in its mothers wombe cannot doe. And can an infant out of the mothers womb do it? so that it is plain even by Mr Marshalls own explication of the Canon, that that Council held that those were only to be baptiz'd, that could make a promise themselves. I doubt not but that this Councill allowed Baptisme of infants, as Nazianzen did in case of danger of death, but I think it is plain that out of that case they allowed not the baptisme of an infant, no not though a beleevers infant; till the child could make its own confession: as appeares from their scrupling the baptizing of the mother converted now with child, lest it should be taken to reach to the child in the womb, and from the generall reason, *that everyone manifests his own free choice in confession.* And I am pswaded that this was the true state of Baptisme in those dayes, in the Greek and Latin Church; that they did baptize all sorts of infants whether of beleevers or unbelievevers, in case of danger of death, least they should perish for want of it; in which case Lay-persons did baptize: and *Augustine contra epist. Parmeniani, cap. 13. lib. 2.* saith, *si autem necessitas urgeat, aut nullum, aut veniale delictum est.* But otherwise they baptiz'd not ordinarily, till they came to years to make their own confession. The cases of Nazianzen, Augustine, and Hierome, Constantine the great, and others; and their solemn baptizing onely at Easter and Whitsuntide, which is observed in the Rubrick of the English Liturgy, methinks should abundantly satisfie men concerning this truth. I cited likewise Grotius his speech of many of the Greeks, who in every age even to this day, doe keep the custome of deferring the Baptisme of little ones, till they could themselves make a confession of their faith. For which words though he cite no Authour, yet I presume Grotius, who is even by Spanheimius often stiled *vir summus*; would not have said it, unlesse he had some ground for it. Mr Marshall sayes, I might blush for justifying the Anakaptists, in saying that the Ancients, especially the Greeke Church have rejected the baptisme of infants for many hundred yeares; meaning in the first ages after Christ. But as yet, neither Mr Marshall nor his friend have shewed me sufficient reason why I should retract it. For what he brings out of Photius and Balsamon, men of much later standing about the later Canons,

89

concerning Infant-Baptism;

Canons, and imperiall lawes of the Greeks; and one of the 8 Canons concluded in Cartage against the Pelagians, requiring infants to be baptized: proves not, but that the Greeke Church rejected baptizing of infants many hundred of years in the first ages; nor doth it overthrow that of Grotius, that many of the Greeks (she doth not say the Greeke Church) in every age to this day doe keep the custome of deferring the baptizing of little ones, till they could themselves make a confession of their faith. Yea, the lawes brought by Mr Marshall rather prove it. For why should lawes be made for it, but because many did neglect it? And the story out of Balsamon about captives of Christians, rather shewes that some were not baptized, when little ones even among Christians, because they determine if there were no witnesses to prove their Baptisme, though children of Christians; they should bee baptized.

As for Grotius his being a friend to the Socinians, it is nothing to me, who knew not Grotius nor his wayes; nor ever pleaded for him. Yet I remember I have read that though he was accused thereof long agoe by Ravenstergorms, hee was justified by Vossius, and what ever River, Maresius, Laurentius charge him with, yet his works have a place among the learned, and may be read and made use of cum judeicio, at least as the works of Papists, Lutherans, Prelatists, &c. who yet may be tainted with errores. Even Theophilus Philokyrates, Loncardiensis; if I mistake not Master Marshalls friend, doth in the very title page of his *Dies Dominica*, and in the book make use of Baronius his testimony in his *Annals*, uniusque et workas much excepted against us Grotius. Nor doe I find that in that wherein I made use of Grotius, he hath deceived me; or I or he wronged the truth, or our Reader.

Mr Marshall pag. 54. of his *Defensio* saith, that he perceived I have made great use in this controversy of an Arminian booke commonly knowne by the names of censura censure. Whereas I never read the booke or made any use of it, till I read this passage in Mr Marshalls *Defensio*. But since I confess I have read chapter 23 of it, and am by that I find there the more confirmed in that truth, wherein I concurre with that Author: though the truth is the chiefe light I had for antiquity in this matter, was some little reading of my own, and that which I read in Vossius his *theoriæ de pedobaptismo*.

N

But

An Apologie for the two Treatises

But because Mr. Marball hath accused me as having correspondence with them who are not likely to help me with any certain intelligence, that it may appeare that I used what diligence I could to get most certain intelligence when I applyed my selfe to answer Mr. Marbals Sermon, I presumed to write this ensuing letter, to that famous learned Gentleman, Mr John Selden, of the Inner Temple.

Clarissime Vir,

INter theologorum placita hac obtinent, baptismum Ioannis & Christi circumcisioni Iudaica succedere, ejusq[ue] locum occupare: atq[ue] inde pedobaptismi ritum deduci. Mihi vero cum de pedobaptismi origine, tum de successione baptismi in locum circumcisionis an vera tradant Theologi isti, gravis dñi infedit dubitatio. Baptismi enim institutum longè aliud esse à circumcisione, & pedobaptismum in Ecclesiis Christianis nonnisi in seculo post Apostolos secundo obtinuisse plurima suadent. Inter alia vero istud urget, quod leggerim alicubi (quanguam libris jam spoliatus locum judicare nequitam) baptismi ritum fuisse satis notum ante Joannis Baptista tempora in admissione Proselytorum aut Discipulorum apud Iudeos, & interrogatio Pharisaeorum non de novitate ritus sed de autoritate baptizantis querentium, Joannis Evangelie cap. 3. Com. 25. idem innuicere videretur. Et forsitan h[ab]ebit r[ati]o mandata in ipsius modis ratione, apud eundem cap. 3. Com. 25. ad usurpationem istius ritus spectabat. Pedobaptismum vero ignorant fuisse primavis Ecclesiarum Christianarum temporibus assertit Ludovicus Vives comment in Angustini de cunctate Dei, lib. 1. cap. 27. Quapropter vir ornatissime super istis apicibus doctrina successione scilicet baptismi in locum circumcisionis, & pedobaptismi origine, te (cujus peritia in rebus & scriptis Hebraicis & Ecclesiasticis, veritatis amor, amicorum candor satis spectatur, & late predicator) consulendum duxi. Placeat itaque claritudini tua mihi quanquam obscuro vestigio tuam, tanquam lucis diuinae, ostendere, super istare animi sententiam tui imperato. Et quoniam sat scio te plurimis iisque gravissimis negotiis occupari et sponsum tuum, secum pluribus, secum paucioribus verbis tempore a ipsis passo expectabis. L. 1611. v. 11. m. 11.
Londoniensi ex iedibus Rectoris Ecclesiae. A. 1611. m. 11. d. 11. v. 11. m. 11.
Dignitatis vestre obser-
-vacionibus digniter invicem jutemus: ut viuimus tota vanessibus, studio
-et contemplatione duximus. V. 1611. L. 1611. J. ANNE SOTONBEIS.
1611. Thought

aid Though the answer was no other then a reference of me to the books I might meet with in Stationers shops, yet I conceived this advantage I had by it, that what I found in books extatit might be the more safely relied on, and that my diligence to discover the truth would be the more apparent, for which I denied my selfe rest; and without recompence from men, layd out more then my estate could beare.

But M. Mar. seems ready to catch at any thing that may make me suspected, and so bring my writing out of credit; & p. 78. of his Defence, thus he speaks. *I am misinformed by good friends who know & love you very well if your self incline not this way to baptize any, whether Turks or Heathens, who onely would make a profession of their faith in Iesus Christ, & then admit them to al other ordinances, & not have them excommunicated à sacris, but onely à privato consortio; thought their lives should prove scandalous.* To which I say, that I deny not, but that in private conference lamenting the sad condition of these nations, that are likely to cut one anothers throats about the differences between *Presbyterians & Independents*; I have laid that I doubted whether ever excommunication à sacris, or the *Presbyterian or Independent Ecclesiastical government*, would be proved to be *Jure Divino by Christs appointment*. And I confess that I take it to be but a matter of prudence, whether each congregation have it's compleat power and order within it selfe, or that it bee ordered in some things by an assembly of select persons out of divers congregations, and whether congregations and pastours be fixed, or unfixed. And I doubt whether the power of the keyes, *Math. 16. 19.* be any other then doctrinall; whether *Math. 18 15, 16, 17, 18.* contain any other direction then about particular injuries between brother and brother, or *let him be to thee a heathen and a publican*; be any other then shunning familiar converse: whether *1 Cor. 5. 2. the mourning that the incestuous person might be taken away from among them*, was any other then upon solemn fasting and prayer by the whole Church of Corinth, out of a holy zeale to Gods glory by Anathema curse or imprecation, to impigate the vengeance of God upon him for the injury hee had done to God, and the Christian profession; that he might be taken away from them by God, and whether the delivery to Satan were any other then an act of Apostolical power, or such as like them

§ 17. Of my opinion about excommunication, Church-government, the admission unto all ordinances, my former conformity, alleged to alienate mens minds from me and my writings.

92

An Apologie for the two Treatises

had power over unclean spirits tending to the taking away his natural life, as Molinus in his *Vest.* And I conceive the Apostle verse 9, 10, 11, 12. of that chapter, proceeds from that particular occasion to generall directions concerning the declining society with them that are vicious: which directions are manifestly concerning arbitrary and voluntary society in civill things, such as in a fort in some case they might afford to infidels, and then concludes. *And ye shall put away from among your selves that wicked one,* which as Ainsworth observeth on Deut. 17. 7. are the same words that the Greeks useth, Deut. 17. 7 and in like manner, Deut. 22. 21. 22. 24. noting the event of executing judgement by killing, whereby the guilty person and the guilt of his transgression was removed from them. And in reference to the incestuous person it notes the consequent of their mourning that he might be taken away from them, v. 2. not by such a proceſſe as is either used in Episcopall Courts, or Presbyteriall Confistories; or Congregationall meetings (though I think this last way comes nearest to it of any of the three) by conventing, trying, hearing witnessēs, and then pronouncing a judicall sentence according to the determination of one or more by plurality of votes, but by a solemn detestation of the fact, mourning for it, and with joint commotion and concurrence of spirit complaining of it to God, and imploring his vengeance to cut him off, and so to vindicate his own name and people. Which I conceive the Lord did then in an extraordinary way, when they had no Christian Magistrate or other power to avenge that injury to God and his people, in that Churc̄h which was endued abundantly with speciall gifts, 1 Cor. 12. 7. 1 Cor. 12. 1. Cor. 14. Which fact, I for my part doubt how it can be made the foundation of an ordinary meer Ecclesiasticall judgement, with jurisdiction as superiours that claime authority without speciall gift, in the time wherein a Christian Magistrate is ready to execute judgement on such offendors, any more then the fact; Judg. 20. of the whole congregacion of Israel, in avenging the fact of the men of Gibeah, when there was no King in Israel, might be drawn into example for an ordinary practise when they had Judges; muchlesse how hence may be concluded any such thing, as power of suspension from the Lords supper for every emergent scandal so judged by a congregation, or congre-

gregationall Presbiterie. Nor doth the Church loose by having a Christian Magistrate, if that jurisdiction be wanting; sith I suppose it is better provided for by the constant care of a christian Magistrate, if conscientious in executing judgement: if not, such censures have been seldome executed with conscience, or good effect. And though it be, that many magnifie the vertue and benefite of their juridical excommunication, yet the best intelligence I have, makes me question whether it hath not been rather an engine of much harme, as being used rather against dissenters in opinion, and opposers of profit, then men openly vicious, manngagers of that censure generally shewing themselves irreconcileable to them that dissent from them, but favourable enough to vicious living. Nevertheless I deny not, but that there is a discipline proper to the Church, as namely in case of erroneous doctrine, and superstititious practise, contrary to the christian faith or worship according to the practice *Actus 15.* and command, *Fst. 3. 10.* *Rev. 2. 14. 20.* and in case of vicious life according to the scriptures, *1 Tim. 5. 20.* *2 Thess. 3. 6. 14, 15.* *1 Cor. 5. 9, 10, 11.* And if any assembly of Ministers and Rulers bee set up for the better detection of truth, that a person be not charged with those evills upon uncertain reports; I think it agreeable to Gods will, *1 Tim. 5. 19.* And if it happen that any such facts be perpetrated as are like to that of the incestuous person: I doubt not but the whole Church may and ought to declare the person so offending, and to exclude him from all brotherly communion, because I conceive so much was done to the incestuous person, as I gather from *1 Cor. 5. 6, 7.* yet herein they did not act as Judges that had power of jurisdiction over him, but as Physicians out of charity seeking to cure him. And I suppose in the manner of doing these things, we have not certain precise direction from Gods word, but that we are left free by God to order such things though pertaining to christians as christians by alterable rules of prudence. And thus farre I have thought good to expresse my selfe in this matter, because of Mr. Marshalls words tending to render me suspected as if I did *monstrari aliquid aliare,* nurse some monster.

As for my opinion about baptizing, I have publicquely declared when I examined whether to visible Church-membership were necessary reall sanctity in the judgement of Church-officis, that

An Apologie for the two Treatises

by profession sufficient to it, I mean a profession of repentance and faith in Christ, which is *serious, sober, free, and understanding;* but denied that it is necessary there should be a further probation by trying mens spirits, so as to satisfie the particular congregation or Church-officers; that a person be admitted to Church-membership, and the Lords Supper. I confess such triall is requisite in admitting into speciall function, or intimate society; but not to communion in worship. And my opinion is, that as much is required to make capable of baptisme, as of the Lords Supper; and that being admitted to the one, if rightly performed, they are not to be debarred of the other, for want of a further triall of their spirits. And though I never said that *by rectifying Baptisme, all the abuses I mention following paedobaptisme would be removed* (for I did not make paedobaptisme the sole or principall cause of them, that is mans corruption, which will fall into those or the like in some measure, if paedobaptisme were removed) yet it is true which I said in my Examen, part. 2. §. 7. *the onely way to further reformation, is to begin in a regular way at the purging of that Ordinance of Jesus Christ, to wit Baptisme.* Even as though all ignorance and superstition were not removed by removing Latin Service, yet that was the onely regular way to begin at the removing it. And it is easie to conceive, that forasmuch as the grosse ignorance of people is much occasioned by their baptizing afore they know, that if they were not baptized till they knew christian Religion, as it was in the first ages, grosse ignorance in christian professours would be almost wholly reformed, and for christian walking, if baptisme were administred with a solemn abrenunciation, profession and promise by the baptized in his own person, & upon that were baptized, I doubt not but it would have more aw on mens consciences then many other means used or devised, considering how in the primitive times men deferred baptisme for feare they might not enjoy their lusts, and they were counted by some as guilty of inexpiable crime that fell away after baptisme: and on the other side, infant-baptisme is the ground upon which innumerable people ignorant and profane harden themselves as if they were good christians, regenerate, and should be saved without holiness of life, never owning or considering any profession or promise made for them as theirs.

There

There have been other suggestions hinted by Mr Geres, but amplified in clandestine whisperings concerning my former conformity to ceremonies and Episcopall government, which are carried about in private to render me a person suspected, and to lessen the credit of my writing, the chiefe part of which I have answered in my Sermon intituled *Fermentum Pharisaorum*; and the time, end, necessity, manner, and circumstances in doing what I did, being pleas sufficient to acquit me, and the things not belonging to the present cause, but being fitter for private audience. I will trouble the Reader no further with my Apology, assuring myselfe that letting aside this opinion of paedobaptisme and common infirmities, my life, labours, doctrine even in the judgement of those that dissent from me, and knew me, will abundantly answer for me against all clandestine whisperings whatsoever.

And concerning my two treatises, notwithstanding Mr Ley's censure passed perhaps afore he had compared mine and my Antagonists writings together; I may rather say, that by my two treatises there is such a wound given already to Infant-baptisme, that however men may play the Mountebanks and skin it over, it will never be cured at the bottome. For in point of antiquity it still stands good which I asserted, That Infant-baptisme is not so ancient as is pretended, as now taught, is a late Innovation; that a great number of those that sought reformation in the thirteenth Century, opposed infant-baptisme; that the doctrine of Anti-paedobaptisme neither undermines Magistracy, Ministry, Lords day, nor any true interest of the infants of beleevers, that the argument from the Covenant to the Seale, is either a tautology, or invalid without a command; that the Covenant made with Abraham, Gen. 17. was a mixed Covenant having in it not onely promises of spirituall benefits common to all beleevers, but also peculiar promises concerning things temporall; that Acts 2. 39. being meant of Christ and saving benefits by him; as Master Marshall confesseth cannot serve Master Marshals turn to prove his second conclusion which he denies to be meant of the promise of saving grace, as if it were made to beleevers and their naturall seed. As for Master Marshals paraphrase, which he calls argument, pag. 129. 130. of his Defense, I think it to bee most absurd in that it makes the promise, Acts 2. 39. when applyed to the Fathers to be

§ 18. Of the vanity of Mr Ley's vaunt concerning the deadly wound given to my cause, and the contrary demonstrated by a briete going through the principall points about this argument, as they have hitherto been disputed. As about Acts 2. 39. Rom. 11. 16. 1 Cor. 7. 14. Colos. 2. 12. Math. 28. 19. Acts 16, 15. Math. 19. 14. &c.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

95

be meant of justification, when to the children, of outward administrations; nor so expounded are the words true: there being no such promise. That *Rom. 11. 16. &c.* proves not that there is the same Church state in the Churches of the Gentiles, that was in the Jewes, so as that the Infants of Believers should by vertue of naturall generation be reckoned as visible members, forasmuch as now the Church is not nationall as it was then, nor gathered as God did the Jewish Church by taking the whole nation for his people in one day, but now the Church of God is gathered by preaching up and down, some in one place and some in another in succession of time; That *1 Cor. 7. 14.* speakes not of federall holiness, but matrimoniall; yea if the reason of the lawfulness of the living of two persons together in disparity of Religion, be taken from the vertue of faith in the one party, not from the relation of husband and wife, as Mr. Marshall's exposition makes it, the medium of the Apostle to prove the lawfulness of the living of a believing wife with an unbelieving husband, will as well prove the lawfulness of the living of a believing fornicatrix with an unbelieving fornicator; as may appeare by a syllogisticall analysis of the Apostles argument: the major whereof is this, according to Mr. Marshall's exposition. *That man and woman may lawfully dwell together notwithstanding the unbelieve of the one party whereof one is sanctified by the faith of the other for begetting of a holy seed;* this is manifestly the force of the Apostles reason after his exposition. Nor is it necessary to insert [*being husband and wife*] sith the sanctification is not ascribed by him to the relation of husband and wife, but to the faith of the one party, as the proper cause of it. And by Mr. Blake Birth, priviledge, pag. 11. Holiness in the text, is a fruit or result of faith in the parent. Now the assumption; *the unbelieving fornicatour is sanctified by the faith of the believing whore for the begetting a holy seed* Master Marshall denies not, but balkes only, telling me pag. 163 of his Defence, he could name Divines who are no whit inferior to myselfe, who conceive that a believer even then when he committs fornication with an infidell, doth so remove the barre in the unbelieving party, as that the child is (in the believing parent's right) to be reckoned to belong to the Covenant of Grace, and the Church of God, which is in this sense to be sanctified; and it must needs be granted, for positive cause

ponitur

ponitur effectus, if the quality of faith be the cause of that sanctification, the sanctification followes in one, as well as the other. The conclusion then followes from Mr Marshals exposition, that *the believing fornicatrix may still live after conversion, with her unbelieving fornicator; for they are still sanctified for the begetting of a holy seed; and the children so begotten are federally holy, it being Gods rule in this case:* if Mr Marshall say true, *partus sequitur meliorem partem.* But this is so absurd a thing that I believe Mr Marshall himselfe will when he understands it, quit his chiefe hold, and the judicious reader explode the exposition of *1 Cor. 7. 14.* of federall holinesse.

And for the third conclusion of Mr Marshall, he hath not yet proved that the rite of Baptisme was appointed by Christ to succeed into the room, place, and use of circumcision; or that a command concerning circumcision, should be a command concerning baptisme: yea my exposition of *Colos. 2. 11, 12.* is acknowledged right by Mr Marshall, and consequently his inference overthowne, as I said above. As for that which I alleged that *Baptisme was an old rite among the Jewes in initiating Proselytes*, to shew that baptisme in exact speech doth not succeed circumcision, but is a continuation of an old rite to another purpose; as in exact speech the Lord doth not succeed the Passover, but is an old rite used at the Paschall supper among the Jewes, and continued by Christ to another purpose; Mr Marshal catcheth at as a proof for Infant-baptisme, because *then the Proselytes children were baptized:* pag. 256. But the answer to it is easie. For though the rite of Baptisme was an old use continued by *John Baptist and Christ*, yet I say it was to another purpose or use; as I shew, pag. 89. 90. of my *Examen, clean of another nature;* as Mr Lightfoot *Harmony, part. I. pag. 138.* and was used according to another rule then among the Jewes. For they did not baptize Jewes either elder or younger as the same learned men I cited confess, but onely the Gentiles because they were unclean; and they were initiated by sacrifice as well as baptisme, with many other differences: but *John the Baptist and Christs Disciples baptized Jews as well as Gentiles, without sacrifice.*

Baptisme and
the rite of eat-
ing bread and
drinking wine
through old
rites among
the Jewes yet
used to ano-
ther end, and
after another
rule by Chri-
stians.

As for Mr Marshals fourth conclusion, he confesseth pag. 128. *that the formal reason of the Jewes being circumcised was the com-*

An Apologie for the two Treatises

The command
confessed to be
the formal rea-
son of circum-
cision by Mr
Marshall.

mand, which if true; it is the distinguishing and constituting reason, *qua posita ponitur res, non posita non ponitur*; so that the Jewes ought to be circumcised because of the command, without a command what ever were their interest in the Covenant or Church-state, they were not to be circumcised. Now this is as much as need be to overthrow Mr *Marshalls* argument, which is to prove that infants are to be baptiz'd precisely by vertue of interest in the Covenant without a command, because as hee supposesthe Jewes infants were circumcised meerly by vertue of the Covenant; for to the analogy or proportion in his reasoning must hold. The Jews infants were in the Covenant, and therefore were to be circumcised; *Ergo*, it must be so with beleevers children now in Baptisme; where the formall reason is supposed to be the Covenant: but Mr Marshall both pag. 92. & pag 182. confesseth the formall reason is the command; and therefore though the Covenant be put, yet if the comand were not put, circumcision of infants had been no duty, but a will-worship; and by parity of reason it is so in baptism: infants are not to be baptiz'd barely by vertue of Covenant-holiness without a command, which is the main thing I contend for.

Circumcision
a priviledge
proper to the
Jewish Church
state.

As for the fifth conclusion of Mr Marshall, that which I answered continues still, that circumcision though it were a priviledge to the Jewish Church, as the Arke, Tabernacle, high Priest, Temple were, belonging to that nationall Church-state, to have themselves and infants circumcised; yet it was a priviledge proper to that time not now to continue: as the Apostle, Gal. 3. & 4. Heb. 9. & 10. shewes, it did not belong to the substance of the Covenant of grace common to Jewes and Gentiles; and so neither is it or any thing in the room of it any more a priviledge to us now then some house the room of the Temple: some chief Bishop in the room of the High Priest, &c. And therefore I say still, that this argument is indeed of no weight, but among vulgar and non-syllogizing capacities; and that Divines that use it do but flatter the people by it; and that if the reason be good, it overthrowes our compleatnesse in Christ, in whom we have Circumcision, Arke, Temple, Priest, all; and as I said in my Exercitation it is the very egg of which most of the Popish ceremonies were hatched; to wit, because they thought wee must have priviledges as the Jewes, and

and therefore must have something like that they had.

Mr Marshall, pag. 195. of his *Defence*, speaketh thus. *First for the point of will-worship I shall desire you to prove this conclusion. That all things belonging to christian worship even in the circumstances of it, evenc the ages and sexes of the persons to whom the ordinances are to be applyed, must be expressly set downe in the new Testament; if you prove not this, you say nothing to the purpose, for this is our very case.* To which I reply. That I owe not M. Marshall such service, as to prove what he shall like another *Eurystheus* injoyne me : I have pag. 114. pag. 152 of my *Examen* lyllogistically set down my argument to prove Infant-baptisme will-worship, it belongs to him to tell me what he denies in my syllogisme, that I may prove it, though I have already done it, and shall doe more fully when he tells me what he doth deny : but it is a meer shift for him to impose on me the prooфе of a Proposition I owne not, and not tell me what he denies in my own syllogisme. This is contrary to the rules of disputation I have been acquainted with; yet if Mr Marshall shall declare that he holds the Subject of baptisme to be but a circumstance, I shall be ready to oppose him therein further ; and shew that the point in difference is not the bare age or sexe, but qualification of persons to be baptized; yea the reason and main use of Baptisme.

As for Mr Marshals principle for his virtuall command I have shewed above; that when he should have brought all Protestant Divines averring this maxime, that *all the commands and institutions of God about the Sacraments of the Jewes, bind us as much as they did them in all things which belong to the substance of the Covenant, and were not accidentall to them:* instead of this he alleageth another thing, that Protestant Divines make *the same generall nature, end and use of our Sacraments, and the Jewes Sacraments,* and argue thereupon from one to the other, which is quite beside the businesse. For the maxime is of commands about the Sacraments, and they are all about the rituals of administrations, and conceriting commands about the Sacraments, binding us as the Jewes, he produceth not one command binding us, or one Protestant avowing it.

No command
about the
Iewes Sacra-
ments now in
force.

As for the command, *Math. 28. 19.* when I said, *μακειν δισι-
signis to make Disciples, but no where are infants said to be disci-
pled,*

An Apologie for the two Treatises

Infants not
Disciples, as
Math. 28. 19.
is meant.

pled, Mr Marshall tells me that some learned criticks say that ~~usdrus~~
~~usdrus~~, answers to an hebrew phrase among the Rabbins, of admission
of schollers that they may be taught; which though I beleive not,
yet if it were granted serves not Mr Marshals turn, unlesse he can
shew that infants were said by them to be thus admitted schollars.
Then Mr Marshall referres me with a blind direction to *Spanheimus*, whom I have consulted, and I find many absurdities in that
learned Authours words *dub. Evang. part. 3. dub. 27.* This in ef-
fect he sayes that ~~usdrus~~ contains not the act the Disciples were
to doe, but the end of their sending, which I think is so absurd that
it needs no other refutation then the mention , and then that they
might ~~usdrus~~ without teaching them; whereas he himselfe sayes,
non significat solum docere sed & Discipulos facere, so that accord-
ing to him it includes teaching and somewhat more , and *equi-*
pollet & usdras non Io: 4. 1. which was by teaching , and the pa-
rallell place, *Mark 16. 15.* is, *preach the Gospell to every creature.*

Baptizing
households
inferre not in-
fant-baptisme.

I had said in my Examen, that the speech of baptizing Lydia's
hou[se]hold , Acts 16. 15. must be understood by other places which
when they expresse the baptizing of the hou[se]hold, they expresse also
the believing or receiving of the word by the whole hou[se]hold , and
by the frequent [Mr Marshall alters it into sometimes] use of the
word, which is to putt the house for the people of growth in it. Mr
Marshall saith, who taught you it must be so interpreted? I answer,
Augustin lib. 3. de doct. Christ. c. 26. ubi autem apertius ponuntur
ibi discendum est quummodo in locis intelligentur obscuris: Charrer
panstrat, Catol. tom. 1. lib. 16. c. 6. and all thole Divines a-
mong which I think Mr Marshall is one , that say we must ex-
pound one text by comparing it with others that are like. To that
I said, that [house] is frequently taken for the grown persons in
it; Mr Marshall saith, it may very well be granted, and here is not me,
unlesse you can prove it must be so meant. Though I think I proved
it must be so meant , yet it is enough to shew that Mr Marshall
cannot prove from the baptizing of households an example of bap-
tizing an infant, sith, the word house may be taken (as Mr. Mar-
shall may very well be granted) for the grown persons in that houle.

As for Mr Marshals second argument , because there was an
equivocation in it, and in one sense the major must be denied , in
another the minor ; and if the major be understood in one sense, the
minor

minor in another; there bee soure termes, and the syllogisme is naught. To this Mr Marshall makes no reply in a logicall form, but tells us in a loole discourse, that forasmuch as there is no infaltable ground of certainty, but onely of charity, that any growne person to be baptized hath actually the inward grace; and so in charity wee are to conceive of beleevers infants, because Christ said, Mark 10. 14. Of such is the kingdome of God, they are to be baptized. So that in his Defence Mr Marshall alters his argument which he set down in his Sermon, concluding not from a capacity of inward grace to Baptisme as he did then; but from the judgement of charity that they have actually the inward grace, which he seems to count sufficient for Baptisme. Mr Geree his reasoning is to the same effect: *vindic.p&dobapt. ch. I. sect. 7.* and is thus formed by him into a syllogism, where we have evidence for judgement of charity, that there is the grace of the Covenant, there we may see the seal of the Covenant. But we have evidence for the judgement of charity, that in infants of beleevers there is the grace of the Covenant. Ergo, Of this Syllogism I deny both major & minor. *Act 10.47.* doth not provethe major. For the Apostle there did not baptize upon a judgement of charity of what was latent, but from a certaine sense of their magnifying God, and the gift of the holy Ghost; nor was *Simon Magus* baptized because in the judgement of charity hee had the grace of the Covenant, but because he professed the faith, which was certain to *Philip*. And this was *Master Marshall's* doctrine in his Sermon, pag. 47. where he confesseth that the Apostles charity or charitable conjecture was not the ground of their admitting them to the ordinance, but the profession and confession of the party made according to the word, which they were bound to rest in. And therefore I see not how Mr Marshall can count a judgement of charity sufficient for Infant-baptisme, without crossing himselfe in his first Sermon. For my part I doe not think a Minister ought to be ruled in baptizing by his own judgement of charity (which is ofttimes very uncharitable to those that deserve beth) but by certain knowledge of true sanctification by extraordinary revelation, or of the parties profession of the faith by other meanes, either of which is sufficient, not both necessary. Nor do I require of infants more assurance then of grown men, but shewes of repentance and faith in either. Yet, as when one being required

We have no
evidence for
judgement of
charity con-
cerning in-
fants, nor is a
judgement of
charity to be
our rule in ad-
ministering
Baptisme.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

102

to bring no more then a servants testimony for the grant of a thing, if he bring the masters hand and seale without the servants testimony and the thing be granted; he that grants it doth require no more then the servants testimony : so when I say, if shewes of repentance and faith be exhibited, *I will baptize*, and *I will baptize* upon extraordinary revelation; that an infant is a beleever: *I doe not require more assurance of an infant then of a growne person*, when *I lay*, if the infant professe the faith, *I will baptize*, if God witnesse for it that it is a beleever *I will baptize*, in neither goe *I* by judgement of charity, but certainty either of revelation or profession, which neither Master Geree nor Master Marshall can make good of all the infants of beleevers. But faith *Master Geree there's evidence in charity to judge that the children of beleevers have the grace of the Covenant*. To this *I* answer, the evidence for judgement of charity is to be taken from a persons own deeds according to the rule, *1 Cor. 13. 7. charity believeth all things, capacity of grace is common to all persons on earth*, and therefore is no ground to baptize one more then another. That *some infants have been actually partakers of inward grace*, as *Mat. 19. 14. Luke 1. 15. Jerem. 1. 5.* yeelds nothing to prove any judgement to be right that it is so in any other, but onely that it may be so. *Infants of beleevers are not under the Covenant of Grace or within the externall administration of it*, by virtue of *Gen. 17. 7. Deut. 30. 6.* they speak of more then externall administration, and must be understood of the elect which the Apostle denies to have bin ever by God assured to the natural seed, *Rom. 9. 8. 15.* no judgments of charity that the infants of beleevers are under the Covenant of Grace can be deducted from these texts, the most is conjecturall hope that it shall be so, which experience shewes to mis-carry often, therefore these things yeeld not a warrant for infant-baptisme. Doctor Homes argues from *Matth. 19. 14.* that *baptizing did in nature antecede imposition of hands*, which is falle; nor doth *Heb. 6. 2.* prove it. Nor is his argument good, *Infants had the greater Christs blessing, therefore they had or might have the lesse, to wit Baptisme*; which reason if good, it would follow they might have the Lords Supper, be ordained Ministers: for these are lesse then Christs blessing.

• § 19.
Of Master
H. G. his pre-
tended satisfa-
ctory answer
to my exerci-
tation.

Afore the printing of this Apologie, I met with and read a book of

of one Mr William Hussey a man unknown to me saving by a former treatise of his which I have seen, and he intitles it *satisfactione* to Master Tombes his scepticall exercitiation: and in his Epistle to the Reader he saith, and here I will turn sceptique with Master Tombes. If I should give him the title of fantastike in requitall of the title of scepticke he pins upon me, I could give better reason for it then he brings for his imposition of that new title on me: but it is enough for me to clear my self. *Gel. l. ii. c. 5.* noct. Attic. fayes, the Pyrrhonian Philosophers were called *Sceptickes*; that is, seekers and considerers, because they determined nothing, but were always in considering and seeking; but Master Marshall thinks me guilty rather of too much selfe-confidence. Yea in this point though I did as I conceived befitting me then, propound my thoughts in the disputation with my brethren in the miniltry, and in my *Exercitiation* to the Committee of the Assembly under the term of doubts; yet in my *Examen* I assert them as positions, and therefore that authour doth unworthily intitle my *Exercitiation scepticall*, or me a *scepticke*: which is in effect if he understood what he layes, to accule me as adhering to nothing as certain in matters of sense, reason, or faith. But concerning the book though he intitle it *satisfaction*, and the licenser fayes [finding it to be in his judgement solid and judicious] and I am pretty well acquainted with the humour of men, who are ready to cry up any thing as satisfactory, which they affect; yet / beleive the Assembly will not conceive his book satisfactory, nor these passages following to be solid and judicious. As that in his Epistle to the Reader he calls *Baptisme the scale of the proffer of Grace*. pag. 3. *Answer*, that was an especiall privilege of the Iewes that they had their civill lawes from God, but what lieth upon a nation as a duty that it may require of all, and cuts off them that refuse it and this is implied in the Commission, when Nations shall covenant to be Disciples, which may be done by a part for the whole, then are such as are in commission from Christ commanded to baptize and teach the whole nation, such as are in authority may covenant in a nationall way for the inferiorre sort, and justly require all externall performances frons them, such as baptisme and submission to bee taught are, pag. 4. And what a parent can doe over his child in matter of duty, that may the parents of the country, the Magistrates require of

An Apologie for the two Treatises

104

of the nations. God requireth it of them, they may put all nations to schoole to Christ. Now, what if some of them be too young to learne, yet if they be under the discipline of the Master they are Schollers? as may appeare in many little children that are set to schoole to keepe them safe, and from wantonesse, before they be of capacity to learne, many have a Hornbooke given, more for a play-game then a booke, yet are they Schollers, because under the discipline and correction of the Master; is it not therefore great reason, that a Christian should dedicate his child to Christ, to be partaker of the blessing and discipline of Christ? pag. 5. And certainly words could not have been invented that could have required the Ministers to baptize all the World, Infants and all, willing or unwilling; so that any would see they might be taught, and submit to the precepts and discipline of Christ, then to expresse it by the word nation and disciple. pag. 12. Abrahams seed must be divided into equivocall and univocall; equivocall seed Christ, for that he was not like Abraham, he was of Abraham, but ex parte according to the flesh. Rom. 1.3. He was the promised seed, not the seed unto whom the promise did belong, as the seed of Abraham. pag. 43. That which we argue from receiving of families, and from the Apostles commission to baptize nations is, that nations may make Lawes for their whole nations to be baptized; and if the major part of a nation do according to their duty receive baptisme, and undertake for the whole nation to submit themselves to become Schollers of Christ, they may justly compell by any penalty to joyne with them in the externall worship of God. This therefore is it which is drawn from the commission directed to the Disciples for the baptizing of nations, that nations may act as nations, and families as families; that is, that the more organicall parts must act for the residue, the magistrates for the nation, the master of the family for the residue, the magistrates for the nation, the master of the family for the family; otherwise it cannot be said to be the act of the nation, or of the family, though a post factum may be historically related to overspread a nation that is done without a nationall consent, to shew the universality of a spreading evill: yet, where a duty is charged upon a nation, it cannot be orderly received without a nationall consent. pag. 44. He that keepeth any servant that will not be baptized, is not a good Christian: it is true, all men of discretion ought to con-

sent

concerning Infant-Baptisme,

105

sent to every duty; baptisme is a duty without exception, as all other precepts are; it is pactum impositum. pag. 46. The parties to be baptized are all nations, without any restriction at all. 47. If they that claime their interest in baptisme can undertake for whole nations, the commissioners must not refuse them i the nation believeth by the magistrate, by whose authority the whole nation is put to school to Christ. pag. 54. Men may require of him that is of years to consent to his baptisme, laying the neglect on him as a finne, and punishing him for it as for adultery, fornication or any other publique offence. pag. 59. If any will bring Turkes children, and Infidels to baptisme, and assaine the instruction of them in the doctrine of the Goffet, I know nor bat they may; and if Turkes would part with their children to Christians, I thinke it were a very charitabile shing so to do: For the promise was never so tyed to Abrahams loynes, neither for ought I know, to any believers, but to education in the family of Abraham, or any other believeng family. pag. 61. They that believe, and they that believ'd not heare the word, and it is no prophication of the word to Preach it to an infidel, neither is it any prophication of baptisme, to baptize an Infidel. pag. 64. And indeed, it were a very strange thing for the Sacrement of baptisme to be rendered to men that were already clean, and approved, declared and manifested to be cleane; it is true, it may be tendered to men that profess their faults, because man cannot judge them faithfull, notwithstanding any profession, and therefore baptize them; but if they could know and judge them faithfull, they might give them the Lords Supper, in which all Christ is communicated, and baptisme should not be needfull. baptisme is the seal of the tender of Christ, and of the purging power of His bloud, not of our Communion, or partaking of Christ; that is sealed in the other Sacrament. pag. 64. It is true, adulcys must have faith, such as it is, naturall, humana: before he can be baptized, he must be willing by some inclination or other: it were barbarous to baptize a grown man against his will, which could not be gotten but by some kind of credence, though it might be just with man to punish him with death that should refuse, as it is with God, to punish with eternall death such as despise baptisme. Nor do I thinke the principal ground of his new conceit pag. 3. will satisfie, which is, that Mat. 28.19: is thus to be expounded, make all Nations Disciples by baptizing them, and

An Apologie for the two Treatises

reaching : whereas he himselfe sundry times reads it better, make Disciples of all nations baptizing them, and it is vainely alleged that [by] is implied in the participiall expression , any more then verse 9. *istomus dominus agnus* must be expounded hee met them by saying, or *Matth.27.55.* *modus ducere discipulos eorum* they followed by ministring unto him; and I said justly, *Examen pag. 127.* this conceit is so absurd, that I presume none that hath any wit will entertain it, though Master Hussey say page 6. I thinke if ever a man were out of his wit, it was here : but I shall be willing the Assembly judge whether of us two need sayle to *Anticyra* to purge our braines. As for his answer to my booke though I conceive it lettice fit for some lips, yet in my apprehension it containes a fardell of mistakes, in Logick, Divinity; and sometimes in Grammar , but most of all of my meaning, and the scope of my words, and force of my reasons, which being diligently compared with his booke, are a sufficient reply to it. And therefore though hee conclude with a challenge to me, yet he must pardon me if I make more account of my time then to cast it away in refuting such wild notions as he hath vented, except I shall have so much spare time as to write a booke to make sport with ; wishing nevertheless that Master Hussey had some schoole of Divinity as he desires, that he might be either better fitted to write, or learn to be silent.

S. 20.

The Epilogue
of this Apolo-
gy concerning
the reason of
the enlarge-
ment of it, the
Authors pre-
sent estate and
future inten-
tions.

I have been larger in this matter then I intended at this time, that I might shew the vanity of Mr Leyes vaunt , and however God dispose of me, doe my indeavour to cleare the truth in this thing, and to prevent perleculion of it through the provocation and exasperation of spirit towards Anti-pædobaptists, which since these writings have been published, hath many wayes discovered it selfe. If the Lord spare me life, liberty, and meanes , and it bee found necessary; I may either more briefly or more largely rescue my treatises from their hands , who have ill handled them and perverted the truth. In the mean time this which is already said might serve a judicious Reader to answer the writing of my Antagonists though no more should follow. Mr Mar. book it appears from pag. 59. 212. 227. was contrived by divers : I believe the ablest of the Assembly . I wish it were declared whether the Pædobaptists would stick to that work or any other. I heare there are more yet to be printed, if the aime be to oppresse me with number, or

or to have this evasion; that when one is answered, yet some other is not answered; and so to uphold the error still (which is a way of Jesuites) I doubt not but God will defend his truth. What hitherto is objected against my two Treatises and Appendix, I doubt not but with Gods assistance to answer. Afore I could finish this Apology, I have tasted the fruits of Mr Marhals, and Mr Gerees accusation in a message from the Benchers of both houses of the Temple; that though they acknowledge my life and labours among them unproveable, yet by reason of the publishing of my treatises they cannot continue me here. It was foretold me, that some of the assembly would not give over till they had oued me hence. If any of them have diswaded the people from hearing me, though they cannot shew that I have preached any other thing then Gospell truth; if they use any arts to withdraw the people from me, I wish them to consider how they can acquit such actions from the sin of making schisme, and stopping the course of the Gospell for their own ends, not permitting any to preach the Gospell without concurrence in opinion with them, when as Paul rejoiced that Christ was preached; though it added affliction to his bonds, Phil. 1. 18. what my desire was in the Prologue of my Examen, is still, that ~~we may give one another the right hand of fellowship, and stand fast in one mind in the truth of the Gospell, and cleare the truth of God to the people whose eyes are upon us.~~ I may call God to witnesse that my ayme in making and publishing my Treatises, was the benefit of the Assembly by making knowne to them reasons why the Doctrine of the Directory should be better examined, which would be their honour: if they disclaim me, reject me, repay evill for good, I hope God will help me to bear it, and to love them still, and joyn with them in promoting the work of Christ; notwithstanding I meet with discouragements where I assured my selfe greatest encouragement.

To conclude; as the case now stands, I know not into what corner of the world God may carry me, nor how I may be accommodated to publish any thing more either in this of Infant-baptisme, or any other point of sacred knowledge; it is not a little comfort to me that I have framed this Apology, it shal be my witnesse in time to come that I have sought unity with truth; and as I have made it my busines to preserve purity of doctrine, so I shal stil

An Apologie for the two Treatises

though I have neither found recompence nor help considerable
from men, but rather am likely to meet with a consumption of
state, & a shortning of my dayes. However things succeed, I shall
request that they that can pray, would beg for me that I may doe
nothing against the truth, but for the truth; and for the Churches
of Christ, that the Pastors and teachers in them may take heed of
bending their wits to maintaine what the prime reformers, and
Churches ordered by them have avouched, rather then impartial-
ly and throughly to examine their doctrine, which as it is a great
fin of making other masters then Christ, so it is a cause of most
mischievous rents and contentions.

FINNS.

ε Ψ



A Postscript, wherein is a reply to Mr. Blakes answer to my letter.

BE pleased to take notice, that whereas I say p. 21. S. 1. The occasion of this *Apology*. *Molin* in his *Epistle to Bishop Andrewes* (if my memory deceiveth me not) confessed it to have been ab *ipso* *Apostolum* tempore, meeting since the printing of that passage, with the booke I find that in that Epistle he only confessed it to have been *a seculo Apostolis proximo*, but *Bishop Andrewes* saith, he had put out that which ellwhere he said ab *Apostolorum seculo*. Whence my mistake of memory conceiving he had said it there, which he said ellwhere, but altered it in that Epistle. 2. That though I had seen most of the latter part of Mr. Blakes answer to my letter some dayes before, yet I had not the whole booke till Aug. 3. 1626. at which time the tenth sheet of this *Apology* was printing off; and therefore I cannot give thee so large advertisement on it, as I desired to doe; yet I have thought it convenient to say thus much in this straignt of time, as not knowing how I may be hereafter fittid to write any more.

The Booke is ushered with a preface of Mr. Calamy's and Mr. Vines, in which they say. *The right of Infants to Baptisme is carried strongly by Scripture arguments, if legitimate consequence can make any apodicticall evidence.* To which I say, that Master *Mary*'s first argument is accounted the strongest, and that is far from being apodicticall, as hath been shewed above.

They say. *The practice of the Church in all ages in Baptizing infants is carried by such undoubtfull testimonies of credible witnessdomed*

S. 2. Of Mr. Calamy and M. Vines their wrong judgement of the dispute, Mr. Blakes book, and my discussing the point.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

ses, that he that doth not see it may well be called Strabo, that is, goggle eyed.

How true this is the Reader may perceive by the *Examen* of Master Marshals Sermon, and this *Apology*. The best or rather only witness of ancients for such a practise is *Augustin*, concerning whom how little reason there is to count his speech undeniably hath been before declared here, and in the *Examen*.

They say of the Birth-priviledge of Master *Blake*: where thou shalt find the question so truly stated, and set upon the right Basis, and so well fortified, that though there hath been a dust raised (by some who have a better faculty to raffle and intricate an argument than to wind it off) yet there is not the least wing of it routed. To this I say, the state of the question hath small difficulty, little or no disagreement between me and Master *Marshall*, and Master *Geree*, and I thinke the like of others. If by the *Basis* is meant Master *Blakes* observation pag. 3. of the Birth-priviledge, A people that enjoy Gods ordinances convey to their issue a priviledge to be reputed of a society that is holy, to be numbered amongst not unclean, but holy. This observation is ambiguous, it may be true in a sense, that it so happens frequently; but if it be meant in this sense, that they convey by their generation of them a right of visible Church-membership, and title to the initiall seale, as it is usually called it is not true: which onely serves for the purpose. Now the wings by which that observation is fortified out of the new Testament, (wherein the strength lyes) are *Acts* 2. 38. 39. *Rom.* 11. 16. 17. 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. *Gal.* 4. 39. *Gal.* 2. 15. 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. now for three of these to wit 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. *Gal.* 4. 39. *Gal.* 2. 15. they flye of themselves, the first exprestly being spoken of them onely that believe, v. 7. the second to wit, being born after the flesh, cannot be understood as importing a priviledge or benefit, it being spoken of persons to the worser sense, and causing a casting out of the inheritance: the third is meant not of a Jew allusively so called, but of a Jew by naturall generation, opposed to a Gentile, and so cannot be said of the children of believing Gentiles; nor can all Master *Blakes* words keep them from running out of the field. The text *Acts* 2. 39. if it be understood (as it must) of the promise of saving graces by Christ cannot be verified of any but those that are called, which it being confessed to limite the first

branch of the Proposition, and the last, you, and as many as are afarre off; it is to mee against reason and truth that it should be left out in the middle, that is, that when it is said the promise is to you, and to all that are afarre off being called, it should be asserted in that branch that is between, the promise is to your children whether called or not. Of Rom. 11. 16, 17. I have said sufficiently before. Of 1 Cor. 7. 14. somewhat also before: and intend more in this postscript. If Mr Calamy and Mr Vines accuse me of raising a dust, and raffling and intricating an argument (which I imagine they doe because the raising of a dust is Master Marshals phrase) they are answered in this *Apology*. My entring into the lists with Mr Marshall was not out of choice as valning my self, as they mistake; but out of necessity lead thereto by providence of God. How well I have acquitted my selfe may appeare by the bringing of Master Marshall to many concessions which overthrow his first argument. Whether this answere of Master Blake be finewy for argument, I hope in time to examine. I conceive that to put the question upon the right Basis, is to examine whether the formall reason why the Jewes were circumcised, were their interest in the Covenant? whether there be the same Church-state now that was then? whether any command about the Jewes Sacraments now bind us? But I passe to Mr Blakes answer.

Mr Blake chargeth me with defect and neglect of charity. For the former I doe not take my writing to discover it, what I shall deprehend I have failed in, I shall I hope confess to God, and to Master Blake when we meet. My not speaking to Master Blake was, because I presumed Master Marshall had acquainted him with the thing, and the reason of printing my Treatises as they were is declared above. Why I would not take upon me the place of opponent in the dispute with my brethren I gave the reason, because the argument would presently lead them to oppose; this being al my argument against Infant-baptism that I could wel urge in dispute, that it is not appointed by God, and so presently upon one or two syllogismes they must become opponents again, sith *affirmanti incumbit probatio*; I sent not my *Exercitation* to my opponents because I was advised to send to the Committee, named in the *Prologue* of my *Examen*; the rest is answered in the *Apology*.

To

An Apologie for the two Treatises

To the point of antiquity in Ch. 2. I thinke not needfull to adde any more here. To the third chapter sect. i. Master Blake because I said *Examen* pag. 144. those I mention, that you may see what stuffe Padobaptists do feed the people with, doth thus againt reason, and charity inferre, that I branded therein all the Ministers of Christ that ever held Infant-baptisme, whereas my speech being indefinite should in such a contingent matter have been interpreted only as equipollent to a particular proposition, & the words were used onely of that Author, and such as delivered like doctrine, with particular exception of Master Marshall, and many others there named. Passion I confesse was in me sometimes in writing my *examen*, a mixt passion of griefe, and indignation, that Preachers of the Gospell should be so hard, as then I found, and saw likely would be more; to their dissenting brethren upon such weake reasons. But such *contumelious* *conjurings* and practises as Master Blakes sunster conceits put upon me I deny.

S.4. They that deny Infant-baptisme need not teach that Infants perish.

To the second section I answer, that I still conceive, they that deny Infant-baptisme, and graue originall sinne, are not necessitated to say that Infants perish in their birthes. It is true as Master Blake layes, they that will hold a certainty of the salvation of such Infants, they must maintain a promise or covenant to them, but such a covenant I deny to be made as assures salvation to the Infants of beleevers: and I have proved at large, *Examen* part. 3. S.4. there is not such a Covenant. If that Gen. 17.7. be produced, I have proved that it was particularly spoken of Abrahams seed, expounded Rom. 9.8. not to be meant of his naturall seed, but spirituall, and therefore till it be proved that all Infants of beleevers dying in Infancy, are Abrahams spirituall seed; that promise will not inferre the certainty of their salvation. Therefore, this is my judgement: that God will have us to suspend our judgement of this matter, & to rest on the Apostles determination, Rom. 9.18. But they that hold that there is no certainty of their salvation, are not necessitated to hold a certainty of their perdition, for there is a medium between both, a hope though not certain, yet probable, and comfortable, that the children of beleevers dying in their Infancy are saved; taken from some generall indefinite promises: the favour of God to the parents, and the experience that in all ages

ages hath been had of his mercifull dealing with the children of his servants; all which cannot be said of the Infants of Infidels, though on the other side we must not so exclude the Infants of Infidels, as to affirme that none of them are saved. For though the Gentiles were *without hope*, Ephes. 2.12. in respect of the body of them, yet now and then God called some, as Rab about of the visible Church, and therefore we may noe determine universally that out of the visible Church there is no salvation at all: but leave this to Gods free-will. It doth not hence follow, that heathens have equall hopes of salvation with Infants of Christians. For though they have not hopes from their innocency in themselves, or certaine interest in Christ; yet they have more probable hopes of interest in Christ upon the grounds here named. And thus is that section answered.

The fourth chapter is about my censure of his argument from Gal. 4.12. as containing very grosse passages. He accuseth me as one that intended not any ingenuous dealing, because I bring but one branch of the medium in his argument, and yet call it his medium. But sith I intended not a full answer to him, but to Master Marshall it was enough that I only recarde that in which was indeed the strength of his argument, which was that birth after the flesh, ascribed to some men, Gal. 4.19. imports a privilege, title, or Church interest to some in the beforeme of the Church of Christians. In saying this was very grosse, I sayed no more then that which was right: the Apostle opposing persons borne after the flesh, to them that are borne after the spirit, to be cast out, and not to inherit it. But says Master Blake, you shut out the literall sense of birth after the flesh, both from the history, and parallel, and bring an allegorically sense in birth, when the contrary in the text is evident. I answer, I shut not out the literall sense from the history, but from the parallel; and that is so farre from being contrary to the text, that it is expressly said, these things are *not* an allegory. But he further objects, you make birth after the flesh, and birth of the spirit, two contradistinct species of births, that both cannot be incident, & am many where in the distribution of a subject according to its severall adjuncts. I answer, I make them not only contradistinct, but also contrary; and I deny that it is a distribution of a subject according to its severall adjuncts. For then

55.

Of my censure of Master Blakes producing Gal. 4.19 for the birth priviledge.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

the same person should be both borne after the flesh and after the spirit. which I would tell Master *Blake* to be very absurd, but that I would give him no more occasion to say I do *insult, whoop, and jeere*, which he unjustly chargeth on me. And for that he saith, that *Isaack was borne after the flesh*, (though it be true, he was so in the two sensies Master *Blake* mentions which are nothing to this place of the Apostle) it is untrue in the Apostles sense, for then he should be the child of the bondmayd; not by promise, a persecutor to be cast out not to inherit, and a type of legall justiciaries belonging to the covenant in mount *Sinai*, for all these things are true of him that is borne after the flesh, *Gal.4.22, &c.* But the Apostle doth not say, that they are cast out, but mentions a command of casting them out. As if Gods dictum were not factum: if they were not cast out, why doth the Apostle allege that text? But they are in the Church, otherwise they could not be cast out. I answer, I deny not but legall instituaries may be in the visible Church, as *Ishmael* in *Abrahams* house; though the Apostle make the parallel only in the casting out that they might not inherit, but if Master *Blake* would gather any thing hence for his purpose, he must prove that the Apostle makes some to be in the visible Church, by vertue of being borne after the flesh as their prerogative, which is as wide from the Apostles meaning, as East & West. But saith Master *Blake* where I pray you, do I make *Abrahams* seed? it is no grosse error of mine, but a grosse device or calumny of yours. I answer, his words [if there yet remaine in the bosome of the Church children borne after the flesh, so that distinction of births (as applied to Abrahams seed) still hath place amongst believing Christians] shew that he applied birth of the flesh to *Abrahams* seed, else why are those words put in [as applied to *Abrahams* seed] but to shew a double seed of *Abraham*, one borne after the flesh, which is all one with the Apostle as legall instituaries, another borne after the spirit, which is all one as believers? so that this is Master *Blakes* tergiversation, not my calumny.

5.6.
On the necessity of my taking paines in my Examen to find out the meaning of Mr. Marhsals second conclusion by reason of the ambiguity of his expressions-

In The fifth chapter Mr. *Blake* complaines, that I take more paines then needs to find out Master Marhsals meaning in his second conclusion, and after. And indeed I never saw a learned man so run himselfe into a maze needlessly, as you in this discourse do; being at a stand,

stand; you say, whether Master Marshall meanes a covenant of grace, or outward ordinances, as though these two were opposite, and priviledge of ordinances were not of grace, or that saving grace could be had, in Gods ordinary way, without this priviledge. To acquit my selfe of this imputation, I say, that it was very necessary to take that paines I did, to bring my selfe out of that maze which I had not run my selfe into ; but the confusednesse and ambiguity of Master Marshals expressions lead me into. Master Marshall had made this the antecedent in his first argument, *The Infants of beleevring parents are federati, or within the covenant of grace*; This I conceived to be the same with his second conclusion, though against the rule of dispute he varies the terme [federati, or within the covenant of grace] into this, [he would have to be accounted his, to belong to him, to his Church and family, and not to the Devils] which I do not take to be equipollent. This necessitated me to shew the many senses of his words, and to take paines to find out his meaning ; else I knew not what to deny, or what to grant. Now, to clear the matter : when it is said, *Infants of beleevers are federati, or in the covenant of grace*, this may be understood three wayes. 1 They are in the covenant of grace by their owne act of covenanting, because they promise the performance of the condition on their part, and this sense is manifestly false ; and yet when Master Marshall fayes they are to be accounted covenanters, he speakes as if he meant so : For what is a covenanter but he that makes a promise ? 2 They are in the covenant of grace by the administratours act, because he gives them the seale of the covenant ; but then the second conclusion should be, they are baptized or to be baptized, now this being the same with the antecedent of Master Marshals first argument, his argument must be thus ; Infants of beleevers are baptized, or to be baptized, ergo they are to be baptized, which is meerly to trifle : and yet as I shewed above, this is the effect of Master Marshals arguing, who will have his second conclusion, and antecedent understood of the outward covenant, as he calls it. 3 They are in the covenant of grace by Gods act of promise, and this is that which Master Marshall should have said, if he would have spoken plainly without equivocation, God by his promise to the Infants of beleevers puts them in the covenant of grace, or he accounts them

An Apologie for the two Treatises

116

in the covenant of grace, because he hath promised grace to them, and not have said God would have them accounted his by us, by giving them the outward covenant, as he calls it. Now, if he affirme this, that God hath promised grace to Infants of believers, this grace is either saving grace, or outward ordinances. But saith Master Blake these are not opposite, but subordinat. Be it so, yet they are distinct, and the promise of the one is not a promise of the other: the promise of the Word and Sacraments, is not a promise of the Spirit. Now here was the doubt, whether Master Marshall affirme a promise of saving grace to believers Infants, or of outward ordinances. I said neither was true, yet the former was more agreeable to his meaning. To prove this I alledged, that though sometimes Master Marshall, Master Blake and others spake more warily, (in which I dealt candidly with Master Blake, reciting his expresse words full enough for the purpose,) yet I said most of Mr. Marshall's and others expressions, and one expression of Master Blake spake as if they meant that God had made a covenant, or promise of saving grace. And to prove it to be their meaning: produced their allegation of these textes, *Acts 2.39. Gen. 17.7. Matt. 19.14.* which are to be understood of saving grace, and that otherwise the seale would be put to a blanke, and that Master Blake saith, *God promiseth to be a God in covenant to his and their seed, which people in covenant have also a promise from him of the Spirit.* Now what layes Master Blake to this, he denyes not that these textes speake of a promise of saving grace, but askes me how they are meant, whether absolutely or immediately? and then fastens upon me an assertion that is none of mine, and I believe wrongs Master Blackwood too. But herein Master Blake goes from the busynesse, and instead of a respondent becomes a polter. I proved these textes alleged by them for Infants being in the covenant of grace speake of a promise of saving grace, and therefore if Master Marshall meant not that the covenant of saving grace is made to a believers child, these textes are alleged to no purpose by him. This is no place to answere Mr. Blakes unpertinent questions; which he propounds to me as supposing that because I said, the textes are plainly meant of saving graces, therefore I had affirmed, the Jewes and all their seed had an absolute promise of a saving grace: let Master Blake tell us whether

whether in alleging Gen. 17. 7. Acts 2. 39. for infants of believers being in the Covenant, he understand not those texts of a promise of saving grace, which is all / there contend for. As for Mat. 19. 14. it is plainly meant of the kingdome of glory; Luk. 18. 15. 17 Mark. 10. 14. 15. And for the speech of sealing to a blanke, &c. Whether it be true or false it was not materiall to my purpose; but whether it shew that the users of it assert a promise of saving grace to believers. Mr Blake upon a mistake, that I had set down faudry things as my assertions chargeth me as using Bellarmines argument, and sets down his own answer out of Amesius, beside's the busines who onely alleged other mens speeches to shew their meaning. As for his own speech he endeavours to make it good, which for present was not excepted against, but onely alleged to to shew that even Mr Blake asserts a promise of saving grace to infants of believers, for a promise of the Spirit is such. But saith Mr Blake, *Some promises doe suppose a condition: such is the promise of the Spirit us there I understand it, and you may see in Christ's words John 7. 39. in the Apostles words; Ephes. 1. 13.* To which I say that it is true of the speciaall gifts of the Spirit, or the increase, or comforts, or assurance of the Spirit; as John 7. 39. Ephes. 1. 13. they suppose a condicione, but if hee meane it of the regenerating work of the Spirit, (as the words lead me to conceive he meant) then the promise of the Spirit hath no condition, as Doctor Turrette proves in many places particularly. *The Synod of Dore and Arl's., &c. part. 3. Sec. 6.* and it is cleare, for if God have promised regenerating grace upon condition, that condition must be performed either by himselfe or by the person to whom it is promised; if the condition be to be performed by himselfe, it is allone with an absolute promise; if by the person to whom it is promised, then something may be done by a man that may procure Gods grace, and so *gratia Dei datur secundum meritum nostra*, which is Pelagianisme. Now they that say the Covenant of grace in respect of saving graces is made to a believers seed; must either exclude the first promise in the Covenant of grace, Heb. 8. 10 of writing Gods lawe in their hearts, without which he is not their God; or else hold that promise absolute, & so infants of believers must be regenerate & saved. Yet that this is the common doctrine, that believers children have a promise of saving graces, is mani-

An Apologie for the two Treatises

fest in that from hence they assert the certainty of their salvation if they dye in infancy, not considering that if God have made such a promise to a beleevers seed, it will as well assure the salvation of a beleevers seed in old age as infancy; sith in old age they are their seed, and the promise in respect of regenerating grace, which brings with it all the rest, must needs be absolute. And therefore the promises *Deut. 30. 6. Isa. 54. 13.* and such like must be restrained to the elect as our Saviour doth; *John 6. 45. & Gen. 17. 7.* is expounded by *Paul, Rom. 9. 8.* I had said Mr Marshals words *must be understood as the words of the Directory, the promise is made to beleevers and their seed;* which is to be meant of the promise of saving grace. Mr Blake conceives the meaning to be of the promises mentioned, that they are the grace promised; but I perceive he did not or would not understand my words: I did not speak of the word [promises] in the direction for petition, that Mr Marshals conclusion must interpreted by it; but of the word [promise] in that assertion in the doctrinall part [*the promise is made to beleevers and their seed*] which cannot be interpreted of the thing promised; but Gods act of promise, which is laid to be made, to wit by him: afore the promised is obtained. So that this new devile will not serve the words of the Directory.

I had said. *And that in that Covenant (Gen. 17. 7.) should be a promise to us beleeving Gentiles/* which words Mr Blake leaves out in the repetition) *that to our seed should be conferred visible Church-priviledges, &c. is but a dream, &c.* to this saith M. Bl. This objection riseth up against God himselfe, rather then any one of your adversaries. But how this should rise up against God, Mr Blake neither doth nor can shew: Mr Blake seems to runne to his old shift, that God promiseth Church-priviledges upon condition. If so, *Cedo conditionem.* Let Mr Blake set down that condition, and I doubt not but either to force him to confess that the reason of the preaching the Gospell to some & their being visible members, is something in man which will be *Pelagianisme*, or else Gods promise is absolute; and so God not keeping it shall be guilty of Faith-breaking. Master Marshall, pag. 127. of his *Defence* acculeth me that *I sometimes say that Gen. 17. 7. was a promise peculiar to Abraham, at other times it was at the utmost to be extended no further then to Abraham Isaac and Jacob, to have their posterity (as born of them)*

to belong to the visible Church. But Master Marshall wrongs me, I have neither of these Propositions in either of my Treatises; what I conceive of it I have set down plainly, *Exercit. pag. 2. 3.* But Master Marshall would have the promise, I will be the God of thy seed as promising visible Church-membership to belong to the naturall seed of every beleever. 1. because the Covenant was made to him for his Faiths sake. Ans. if that were the motive, yet it followes not the promise belongs to every beleever as Abraham; no more then it followes, the promise, *Matth. 16. 18, 19.* was made to Peter by reason of his confession, verse 16. therefore it was made to every one that confesseth as Peter did, 2. How else should Proelytes children have Church-membership. *Ans.* Not by vertue of that promise, but by vertue of Gods command. *Exod. 12. 48* To his third reason I have often answered and proved, that *Dent. 30. 6. Isai 44. 2, 3. Isai 59. 21.* must be meant of the elect, else how did God keep that promise when he did not circumcise the heart of Davids and Josiahs children. Master Marshall pag. 129. puts this upon me; that I say God made this promise to Abraham Isaac and Jacob, to be the God of them, and their seed. But I doe not remember that I say so any where, nor that the Scriptures sayes so though I meet with promises somewhat like it, *Gen. 26. 24 Gen. 28. 4. 14.* But these promises so farre as they pertain to their naturall seed, were peculiar to them; and pertain not to every beleever, and his naturall seed. For none of the Gentiles are Abrahams seed, but by Faith. From all which I conclude, there is not a promise either of saving grace or Church-priviledge made to the seed of beleevers, and so they are not certainly in the Covenant of grace; in respect of Gods act of promising.

Master Blake sayes, What will you say of those that remembred that God was their rocke, and the high God their redeemer; yet were not stedfast in his Covenant: *Psalm. 78. 35. 37.* These were a people within Covenant. I lay this to it, that by his covenant is not meant Gods Covenant or promise to them, but their Covenant to God; or rather Gods commands called metonymically his Covenant.

Master Blake saith, And where I pray you doe you find those words that christianity is hereditary? Those are no words of mine but a supplement of yours. I answer, thicke words are Master Blakes

120

An Apologie for the two Treatises

Blakes Birb-priviladge, pag. 6. The priviledges which in family, or nation are hereditary are conveyed from parents to posterity, so the child of a noble man is noble, so the child of a christian is a christian, and this is all one as to say christianity is hereditary.

I passe by the vindicating of two speeches of mine in this chapter, because I must halte.

To the sixth chapter I have spoken so much as is needfull before.

In the seventh Master Blake accuseth me for abusing Master Thomas Goodwin, but there is no abuse all; for my words onely make use of Master Goodwins expression, which Master Blake denies not to have been his, but that he altered it, which may be unwitting to me. But for the thing I still say that the Corinthians doubt was not about their children. For that which is the doubt is to be the conclusion of his argument that resolves it, but that which the Apostle speaks of the Corinthians children, it is plain by the argumentative particles [*inquit alio modo*] is a medium of a syllogism, as Mr. Blake page 27 denies not; *nam coniugia probatio est per notiora*, therefore it was not the thing in doubt. Besides ver. 15, 16. following, pertain to the resolution of the doubt *versa 12, 13.*

which shewes that they are all a continued resolution of the same doubt, without any such immethodical interposition of the resolution of another doubt, as Mr. Blake imagines.

As for the occasion of the scruple, sith neither of our opinions is any other then a conjecture, I let it passe. One passage of Mr. Blakes in these words. And I pray you speake mberber you doe believe, that the Corinthians took it for a common received principle, that if a man had an adulterous wife, that his children were legitimate, and not bastards; sait wchif be if your opinion passe for a reason, I know not how he collets from my words; I say, that the Corinthians took it for certain that their owne children were holy, that is legitimate; and I say the force of the Apostles argument lies in this Proposition, that all the children of those parents, whereof one is not sanctified to the other, that is, doe not lawfully couple together are unclean, that is illegitimate; and that the Apostle saith, the unbelieving husband is sanctified to the wife, that is, is lawfully wed by his wife because hee is her husband, as if he had been holy; out of which all the engins of Mr. Blakes will cannot extort the inference, he puts on my opinion.

S. 7.
Of the Corin-
thians doubt.
1 Cor. 7. 12, 13
14.

In the second section Mr Blake sayes, that I heard before Mr Goodwins Lectures of instrumentall sanctification. If it were so, yet I profess I did never heed or know it so as to take notice of it till I heard Mr Thomas Goodwin use the phrase. Mr Blake to my first argument against instrumentall sanctification, saith; And is not this argument of yours of as great force against your interpretation of a matrimoniall, as ours of an instrumentall sanctification? I answer no: for they that cannot beget children may be laid to be sanctified matrimonially, that is, may lawfully come together; but not instrumentally so as to beget a holy seed, which is Master Blakes sense. For they that by age or accidentall infabilities cannot be sanctified for generation, cannot beget children either by Covenant or legitimate. Mr Blake addes. The sanctifying by the believing party here mentioned, respects the issue which you confess in grounding a legitimation of issue upon it. I grant where there is issue, the holiness of it depends on the sanctification; but where there is sanctification, it is not alwayes supposed there is issue, or that there may be issue: to the begetting of which, they are instrumentally sanctified. Mr Blake. This sanctifying (whether instrumentall or matrimoniall) hath its influence upon the seed; such a brand lying upon all the issue, where there is issue (be it bastardy or gentilisme) were enough to conclude against such marriages, one principal end of marriage being posterity. He supposeth it seems, that uncleanenes is here meant, which is such a brand on the issue as is enough to conclude against all such marriages. This is very right, but I subsume that brand in all the issue where there is issue; which were enough to conclude against all such marriages is bastardy, not gentilism. For bastardy in the issue proves the supposed marriage not to be right, but gentilisme in the issue concludes nothing against the marriage: Ergo, the uncleanenes here is bastardy, not gentilism. And thus he hath unawares given the medium of an argument against himself. To my second argument for matrimoniall sanctification, he saith. I know you cannot ignorantly, and therefore I feare you wilfully mistake; the meaning is, you may live together: for all the seed you beget are holy, infallibly, and necessarily holy, as the seed of infidels (neither parent believing) are necessarily & infallibly unclean; so that here is a future certainty, and not a contingency; & it is no: possible to imagine a more full and determinate answer. To

An Apologie for the two Treatises

which I say I am sure Mr Blake is mistaken, whether ignorantly or wilfully, I determine not; for he speakes of certainty of the holinesse of the children in the latter part of the verse, whereas the question is whether instrumentall sanctification for the begetting a holy issue; of which the sanctification in the fore part of the verse is expounded, be contingent or no: and this I am sure is true, and therefore their lawfull living together for present according to Mr Blakes exposition should be taken from a future contingent, which Chamsier truly counted absurd, though as happy a Logician as he was, he foresaw not how it served against himselfe. *Bernardus non videt omnia.*

To my third argument he saith. Here you beg the question and reason flat against the Apostle. That sanctifying which the Apostle mentions is a result of the faith of the believing yoke-fellow, the unbelievever is twice said to be sanctified, but not the believer; the belieever doth sanctify, if any sense can be made of the Apostles argument. I answer. He begs the question, who supposeth what he should prove: Mr Blake doth not, nor can shew I doe so; nor doe I reason flat against the Apostle; the Apostle nowhere saith the sanctifying is the result of the faith of the believing yoke-fellow, if it were so, an unbelieving fornicatour might be said to be sanctified by his believing whore, as well as a husband by his believing wife. The unbelievever is said twice to be sanctified, because the doubt arose from his unbelief; but the faith of the belieever is not at all expressed, to shew that the faith did not sanctifie, but the relation. But if it were meant of instrumentall sanctification, it would come from Gods designation, not the faith of the one party. For whose instrument should he be that is sanctified for begetting a holy seed but Gods? now to this nothing is answered, and so this argument stands good against Mr Blake.

To my fourth argument he saith. Understanding the Apostle of instrumentall sanctification and of fedorall holiness, the proposition [their children could not be holy without that sanctification] is most true, necessarily and universally true, as the issue of such a birth, they are federally unclean and unholie; if afterwards by grace they are changed, this is no fruit of their birth, of which the question is in this place, but of the Gospell work in their soules. To which I say the question is nowhere what is the fruit of birth, but how the Proposition

concerning Infant-Baptisme.

123

Proposition can be true understood of federall holiness, and instrumentall sanctification. And I say it is most certainly false, for many a child of both unbelieveing parents are federally holy. But saith Mr *Blake*, they are not so at their birth. But this is nothing to the purpose, sith the Proposition hath not those words in it, nor the Apostle. The Apostles reason supposeth it cannot be at any time. And yet it may bee certaine that the child of two unbelievers may be federally holy at birth whether it be understood of election, inherent holiness, or outward holiness, if God please to work and declare it. But the issue of them that are not lawfully conjoyned as husband and wife, cannot be made legitimate by God, because it is contrary to the definition of legitimation, which is a state consequent upon birth by the lawfull copulation of lawfull husband and wife.

To my Analysis of the Apostles argument, Mr *Blake* saith the last words; *else were, &c.* may be a medium, and a resolution of another doubt too: but that cannot be, sith it is an argument and that is never drawn from the thing in doubt, but *à notiori*; and that *ab absurdio* which they would not yeeld, but the contrary was certain to them.

Mr *Blake* mislikes not my forming the Apostles argument, but he excepts against the Proposition I conceive the Apostles sequel presupposeth; which is, *All the children of those parents whereof the one is not sanctified as the other, are uncleane.* To this saith Mr *Blake*. I appeal to your selfe, whether the truth of that sequel, by you rightly laid down, doe depend upon that Proposition which you draw from thence. I answer, it doth. Mr *Blake*. Is the Apostles major Proposition of parents in general, or of one parent believ-ing, and another unbelieveing in particular? I answer, it is of an unbelieveing husband and a wife. And yet the Proposition must be of all parents which must prove it; as he that will prove, if an Englishman be noble he is honourable, must prove it by this universall or generall. All noble men are honourable, and not put in, all English men noble; for then the antecedent and conclusion would be all one: whereas the Proposition proving must be larger than the Proposition proved; else we might conclude, *ex meris particularibus*. To say if the unbelieveing husband were not sanctified

An Apologie for the two Treatises

Enchanted by the wife your children were unclean, is all one with this. All the children of the unbelieving husband not sanctified to the wife, are uncleane. Mr Blake saith, *The truth of the Apostles sequelle depends on this Proposition; All the children of an unbeliever are unclean, unlesse for generation, he or shee be sanctified by a beleever.* I deny it, for the termes for generation by a beleever are added by him, not in the Apostle; and so he changeth the terms. Yet it is to be noted that though the Apostles major be of husband and wife in particular, Mr Blake makes the Proposition on which it depends of unbelievers in generall, and so by his own praife justifies me against his owne exception. 2. The Proposition Mr Blake layes down as upon which the major in the Apostle syllogisme depends. *All the children of an unbeliever are unclean, unlesse for generation he or shee be sanctified by a beleever,* is false; and so is that which he saith after. *All those that are borne of unbelieving parents, and one of them not sanctified in the other, are out of the Covenant of grace,* yea the other is false too, according to Mr Blakes opinion; *unbelieving parents never beget children by birth-priviledge holy.* For children born of infidels brought into Abrahams family had right to circumcision, and so were by birth-priviledge holy in Mr Blakes sente. Mr Blake tells me, the Apostles Proposition according to my interpretation is this. *All the children of an unbeliever are bastards, except in generation he or shee be sanctified by a beleever.* But this I deny: I have set down the Proposition according to my interpretation plainly enough already.

My alleging Chamiers words against his opinion was no jeare, but a right way of using an authors reasons against another, against his own opinion. And that I did rightly, for these Propositions according to Chamiers explication are included in the Apostles reason. *omnes nati ex his parentibus quorum alii non sanctificatur in aliis sunt extra fædus gratia. Neque parentes infideles gignunt liberos intra fædus gratia futuros.* The adding [futuros] was necessary, because their being in the Covenant of grace is after their begetting; if I had said, *qui fuerunt nisi sunt intra fædus gratia,* Mr. Blake would justly then have had exception against me as not rightly setting down Chamiers conceit: now those Propositions of Chamier are false, and consequently his explication according to his

his own grounds. The putting in [*aut fornicantes*] was, because I would include both explications of the forepart of the verse, both that of matrimoniall, which I conceive was Beza's, and that of instrumentall sanctification. The using of the term *rid calam*, was no more a jeare of *Chamier* then his using of it a jeare of *Augustin*. But my Anagonists are so touchy, that expressions that are not so much as mothes in other mens eyes are beames in mine.

To the exceptions of Master *Blake* pag. 40. I say, though I did not keep his words, yet I keep the effect of them. If he use not the term *Covenant of grace*, yet I suppose he will not deny he meant that which usually Divines expresse by it in this point, though Master *Blake* thinkes the word *Covenant of grace* cannot be found in his treatise for baptism, yet if he please he may find the word *Covenant of free grace*, pag. 14. of his birth priviledge used to that purpose I ascribe to him where he saith, *the holiness he maintaines is from the Covenant of free grace to all in the faith, and their seed*. My explication of the meaning of the Apostles words Master *Blake* sayes is almost the same with his in terminis. Then I have not wronged the Apostle, and it followes the Apostle calls himselfe a Jewe by nature, as tied to keep the law of Moses. Now I called it a dreame to make Gal. 2.15. & Cor. 7.14. every way parallel, they neither agreeing in scope, occasion, words, nor matter, which are dissimilitudes enough. I grant his sense of the word *nature*, and that the Apostle there speaks of himselfe and other Jewes as in reputation more holy then the Gentiles, because of their interest in circumcision and obseruance of Moses law, but this was proper to the Jewes in that Church-state, who had prerogatives peculiar to them. Master *Rutherford* Due right of Presbyteries. chap. 4. sect. 5 - pag 192. That they had prerogatives above us is cleare, Rom. 3.1, 2, 3. Rom. 9.4. But I deny that, a holiness of birth flowing from a parent believning, and in Covenant is asserted, a Cor. 7.14. The term *finnes* of the Gentiles is not all one with *uncleane*, a Cor. 7.14. But the chiefe thing he brings that text for, is to prove that our children have a Covenant holiness because they are to be comprehended under the first member of the distinction Jewes by nature. I wondered at this his collection, but it seems Master *Blake* takes the term *Jewes* not properly

S.9.

Of M *Blak*'s
misallegation
of Gal. 2.15.
which was the
text he chose
for his birth-
priviledge.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

126

perly for people so called because borne in Judea, or of Jewish descent, but allusively as *Rom.2.28,29.* But Master *Blake* doth not observe that the terme *Jewe* allusively taken is a term common to all godly people, or beleevers, whereas here *Jew* is taken as opposite to them that are of the Gentiles; and the denomination of a *Jew* allusively taken is not from nature or birth, as here Master *Blake* rightly expounds the word *nature*, but from faith, as the term *seed of Abraham*, and the *Israel of God*, and the term *circumcision* *Philip.3.3.* So that Master *Blakes* owne exposition overthrowes his owne inference. But then saith Master *Blake*, our children must be under [*sinners of the Gentiles*] and so they are *aliens dogs without hope, &c. Ephes.2.12.* I antwer, our children are of the Gentiles, who were sinners, and as the Apostle speakes *Ephes.2.12.* at that time that went before their calling *strangers from the Covenant of promise, &c.* But it doth not follow that he that saith our children are of the Gentiles, who were once strangers from God, and so called sinners according to their condition then, must hold that they are so now. The most godly beleever now is under the second member of the distinction, being born of Gentile parents, and yet not as the Gentiles were then, stranger from Christ. Master *Blake* is most vaine in saying, that by my tenet there were no more hope of the salvation of a Christians Infants then of Numa, I acknowledge no such master, nor doth any such thing follow from my words, which are plaine and true; Master *Blake* should, if he would have dealt fairly; have shewed out of which words, and how that followes which he obtrudes on me. When I said the *Jewes* birth priviledge did not intitle them to the *Covenant of grace*, I meant the same with the Apostle, *Ro.9.8.* yet they had this benefit by their birth that they were among the people of God, had the priviledge of circumcision according to the Church-state then, were to eat the passcover; come into the Inner court of the Temple, had the law, Christ was to come of them, *Rom.9.4,5. Rom.3.1-3.* and yet many of them not children of the promise. The *Covenant of grace* being made by God doth promise to all and every person to whom that *Covenant* is made, that he shall be effectually wrought upon. I laid, the common priviledge of circumcision belonging to the *Jewes*, did not arise from the *Covenant of grace*, according to the substance of it;

21

bns

But according to the administration that then was. My meaning was circumcision was common to them which had no part in the Covenant made with Abraham, Gen. 17. neither an interest in the Evangelicall, nor household promises made to Abraham, as for instance *Ismael*: and therefor I say it did not arise from the Covenant of grace, or parents faith as the formal reason why Infants were circumcised, but from Gods command according to that Church-state that then he thought good to appoint. This being clear from Gal. 3& 4. Master Blake interprets it, as if I had said circumcision was not a signe of the substance of the Covenant, and runs out in a large discourse to prove the contrary; which toucheth not me who have expressly granted it *Exercit*: pag. 3. *Examen* pag. 39, &c. And it is a mere calumny in Master Blake, to tell me that I close with the Jesuites, and with high disdain shake off the doctrine of the Protestants. But saith Master Blake, pag. 43. you say in your exercitation, pag. 2. The Covenant made with Abraham is not a pure Gospell Covenant, but mixt. In the same place I explaine my meaning, and prove it so fully, that I wonder that Master Marshall, Master Blake and others are not ashamed to except against it. What the Jesuites say in this matter, or what the Protestants say against them, I have not time to examine. The thing, as I deliver it, is plaine according to Scripture: that there were some peculiar promises made to Abraham, Ge. 17. which are not made to every beleever. To tell us that godlinesse hath the promise of the life that now is, 1 Tim. 4. 8. is nothing to the present purpose, for it doth not follow therefore that godlinesse hath the promise of the Land of Canaan or that Christ should be every godly mans seed, &c. Mr Blake saith, circumcision was a fruit of the faith of the parents, but this is false; for then all, & none but children of beleevers were to be circumcised, which is not true: whose children soever they were, if in Abrahamshouse, if bought with money of any stranger, they were to be circumcised, I had said, circumcision was a privilege in that time of the Churches minority, and this the Apostle delivers, Gal. 3. & 4. Mr Blake takes it as if I had said, the fruition of the promises in such a latitude, were onely a privilege during the time of the Churches minority, and would have me give some Scripture or colour of reason for it, which is to impose on me the proving of that I affirme

An Apologie for the two Treatises

firme not. I said, he that will prove the birth priviledge of our children from the Jewes, must make our case as theirs, and so bring us under the ceremoniall law. This Master Blake puts into a formal proposition of his owne, a man of straw and then denies it, the reaon of my words is plaine, circumcision of Infants was from the pedagogy, or peculiar Church-state of the Jewes, as may be proved from Gal.3.25. G.1.4.1,2,3. and obliged to the ceremoniall law, Gal.5.3. therefore, they that from hence would draw the birth priviledge of our children, must make our case the same with the Jewes, and so bring us under the ceremoniall law. The rest of that section is vaine, and not worth a line in answer. I said truely, that the interpretation of 1 Cor.7,14. of legitimation is no more to be called a singular opinion then Master Blakes, and that I have proved by alleging eleven Authors for it, and can do more.

To the 8th chapter, what he sayes of Doctor Wilmot I assent to : he was a precious man, and my dear friend ; when Master Blake shall demonstrate to me what passages in my booke of scandals are inexcusable, I shall endeavour some way or other to retract them. Why I did not alter one or two passages, that Doctor Wilmot excepted against, I shall be willing to give Master Blake the reason. Master Blake is mistaken in that he saith, that my friend of the Assembly that delivered my letter to Master Marshall, was the man that told me of the Committee of the Assembly, and advised me to present the reasons of my doubtsto them; it was not he, but my reverend and deare Father in law. And that friend of mine of the Assembly, that delivered my letter to Mr Marshall, tells me that though he was desirous to have Master Blakes book printed, that the point might be disputed ; yet he did not approve many of his proofes : but by his speech with me lately, I conceive he did except at lundry of the same things which I did. But to the matter of that chapter. Letting passe the conference, and the occurrence therein, which was promised should not be divulged by any hearers, nor was there any exact record kept of it ; the dispute is now brought to writing, the question is whether 1 Pet.2.9 prove a birth priviledge of Christians, equall to the nation of the Jewes. I deny it, and say the words there are meant of the Church as it is invisible. And to prove this.

I argue

1 I argue from the termes, *chosen generation, royall priest-hood, holy nation, peculiar people, or a purchased people*, that is by Christ's death, Tit. 2. 14. which cannot be affirmed of any other then elect and true beleevers, ergo.

2 From that which is laid of them that were called by God, by his power or vertue, into his marvailous light, and v. 10. that now had obtained mercy which they had not before, which cannot be affirmed of any but elect persons, and true beleevers, ergo.

3 It is laid, v. 7. that these persons did beleeve, contradistin-
guished to them that were disobedient and stumbled at the word, to
which they were appointed, but such are onely the elect, ergo.

4 v. 5. They are said to be built as living stones on Christ, a spi-
rituall house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spirituall Sacrifice accep-
table to God by Jesus Christ, which can agree to none but elect
persons, and true beleevers, ergo.

But the terme nation comprehends Fathers and Children. Answ. The word nation, taken in these passages must be understood restrainedly of a spirituall people, as is plaine by considering that the Apostle Gal. 3. 8 sayes this is the Gospell, *in thee shall all nations be blessed*; that is, beleevers of all nations: else the Apostles collection v. 9. were not right. And so the word Kinred is used Acts 3. 25. compared with Ephes. 3. 15. the word household, Ephes. 2. 19. But they may be said to beleieve with a dogmaticall faith. Answ. Those that do so never come to Christ as living stones, nor are built a spirituall house, which is proper to them that are made an habitation of God through the spirit, Ephes. 2. 22. But the calling of a people is spoken of the ten tribes revolued, Hos. 1. 10. Hos. 2. 13. Deut. 32. 21. Answ. However it be in the places to which the allusion is, it is certaine that here is meant such a calling, as is from darkenesse to his marvailous light by his vertues or powers; which therefor deserve to be shewed forth, and which they do shew forth that are thus called. And this is confirmed from Rom. 9. 24. 25. 26. which is manifestly said of them who were called v. 23. vessels of mercy; nor is this a denomination a parte praestantiori, for it is expressly laid *as were the same whom he called vessels of mercy*. And I still say that I wonder Master Blake would persist in maintaining so grosse an abuse of this Scripture; in which I hardly beleieve any approved writer joynes with him.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

§ 11.
Of precedents
for women's
receiving the
Lords Supper.

Master Blake had laid no particular presidence for women's receiving the Lords Supper, more then for this of Infants-baptisme. I alleged 1 Cor. 11.28. where I said ~~disposess~~ comprehends both sexes, To this Master Blake sayes ch.9. of arguments from the Grammer use be offorte, then circumcision of females may be proved from John 7.22. I reply, the subject matter of the command as well as the Grammer use of the word prove females to be included. Master Coleman an Assembly man, and an able linguist in his male discis, pag. 32. hath these words. But that I confess is something harsh, that he should aske me where there is an institution for women to receive the Sacrament: where as 1 Cor. 11.28. is as clear for women as men. Mr Martin Blake in his answer to Master Benjamin Coxe ch.7. sect. 4. pag. 82. produceth many places where ~~women~~ is as much quisque any one, Mat. 10.26. Joh. 3.27. & 7.46. Gal. 6.1, &c. I alleged for an expresse example of women's receiving the Lords Supper, 1 Cor. 10.17. & 1 Cor. 12.23: and this I did in the Pulpit at Gabriel Fench-Church, as Mr Blake tells me; and I had fit occasion sith 1 Cor. 10.17. Was my text then, and that text is expresse without consequence for women's receiving the Lords Supper, if [~~me~~] comprehend women as well as men, which Master Blake will not deny. And yet Mr Marshalls allegation to prove women virtually to be circumhoised in the males serves not for his purpose, I alleged Acts 20.4. Master Blake doubts whether it be meant of the Lords Supper, and if it be meant so, he knoweth not how to avoid the Popish argument for communion in one kinde; and that this yeelds a proofe onely by consequence. I answere, if women be comprehended under the term Disciples, and breaking bread be meant of the Lords Supper, as to me it seems certaine; because it was the end of their customary meeting on the first day of the weeke, and therefore could not be any other breaking bread; then the example is expresse without consequence, for women's receiving the Lords Supper. If Mr Blake know not how to answer the Papists, I wish him to read Chamier pastrat. Cathol. tom. 4. de Euch. lib. 9.c.2. §. 34. &c. Master Blake would bring Acts 2.47. for example farre more formall and expresse then mine of Infant-baptisme, and he tell me of a syllogisme. The Lord added to the Church dayly such as should be saved,

savd, Infans are saved, therefore are to be baptized. A strange syllogisme where in the major terminus is not in the major proposition at all, consisting of four termes; and so farre as I can gather in secunda figura ex omnibus affirmantibus: for the medium [saved] is the predicate in both premites, or else the major is particular, and so it confits ex minoris particularibus.

I go on to the next chapter. I said, that it is a new Gospell to affirme that this is one of the promises of the Covenant of grace, that God will be the God of beleevers and their seed. To this Mr Blake saith. A very high charge from that man whch very lately, preached it as a Gospell truth; and now being suddenly otherwise perswaded, can bring no other argumentes then those that are borrowed from Antichristian sectaries, who are confessed subverters of the Gospell. I answer, Master Blake cannot prove that I ever preached that Doctrine, I scarce thinke I did ever preach it: Forasmuch as I conceived, that Doctrine directly contradictory to the Apostle, Rom.9.8. ever since in Oxford I examined Arminius his Analysis of Rom.9. Suddenly I was not perswaded as I shew in my Apology before. I knowe not what Antichristian sectaries he means who are confessed subverters of the Gospell from whom I borrowed my argumentes; I neither had them from Anabaptists, so called, nor Papists: Master Blake giveth way to his passion in this charge. My argumentes I have from scripture, from the most learned Protestants, as he may see Examenpart.3.54. And though it be an old Gospell, that God hath promised to be the God of Abraham and his seed, yet I still averte it to be a new Gospell, to say that God hath promised to be the God of beleevers and their seed. The Covenant with Abraham and his seed I find Gen.17.8. and the urging of this Covenant I deny not Exod.32.13. Dent.9.27. Lvijc.12.42. Exod.3.5. And though I say not that it contained onely the promise of Canaan, but grant it contained the promise of redempcion by Christ, Luke 1.17. yet I like not Charnier saying, to call the promise of Canaan an appendant to the Covenant, sith the Holy Ghost me thinkes speakes otherwise, Ps.105.8.9.10.11. That Tornillius words do mince, cap.39. speak not of Zwinglius his faderall holinesse hath been shewed before; and Erasmus his glasse on Alienes which Master Blake citeth pag.57. saying that Tornillius calls them Candidatos fidati quod natus am-

542.
To say that
God hath pro-
mised to be the
God of every
believer and
his naturall
seed is a new
Gospell.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

biunt & expectant baptismum, do me thinkes prove that Infants were not ordinarily baptizid in his time. Nor do I thinke Master Blake can prove the Doctrine of Covenant-holinesse, out of *Justin martyr, Epiphanius, Augustin, Isidor Pelusiora.*

§ 13.
Of Mr Rutherford & Mr Blake's opinion about holiness of a chosen nation, & immediate Ancestors profession intitling to Infant-baptisme, & the Independents advantage in this point.

I had laid, that I guesse by some words of Master Marshall, Mr Blake and Master Rutherford, that to maintaine the baptizing of all sorts of persons in the Kingdome, as foundlings Infants of Papists, whores excommunicat persons, which is the ordinary practice ; excepted against by Independents, that this assertion was upon the anvil : that when a nation shall receive the faith, that is a great or eminent part ; the governours and chiefe cities and present: at:re bodyes shall receive the faith, that nation shall in like manner have all their little ones capable of baptisme, and counted visible members of the Church, as the posterity of the Jewes were in the time of that Church administration. Mr Blake askes me, in which of these words I pray you, can you find one word of that busynesse which you say is on the anvil. I answer, to let Master Blakes words alone for the present, me thinkes Master Rutherford's sound plainly as much ; For if notwithstanding the Father and Mother were as wicked as the Jewes, who slew the Lord of glory, who did obstinately deny Christ ; the children were holy by the holynesse of the chosen nation, which I conceive when the Ancestors are not included, must meane the body, or generality of the nation ; then the assertion I set downe as theirs must follow : but this I did deliver but as my guesse, yet so as that I thought necessary to oppose it ; and I say, it opposeth their owne grounds, who derive the title to Infant-baptisme from the Covenant, to a beleever and his seed ; but these are not the seed of beleevers, but the seed of them that deny and impugne the faith ; and from *1 Cor. 7.14.* of which Master Blake him selfe taith pag. 38. of his answer to my letter, *The truth of the Apostles sequel depends on this proposition, All the children of the unbeliever are unclean, (that is out of the Covenant in his tente) unless for generation he or she be sanctified by a beleever.* Which speech of Master Blake I conceive plainly overthrowes Master Blakes position in the birth-prerogative, pag. 24, &c. and Master Rutherford's in the words before named. For if all the children of an unbeliever are unclean, unclean for generations he or she be sanctified by a beleever, it will not be

be enough to say the nation is holy, or the mediate ancestors were holy, sith the Apostles position is of the immediate parents, about whose living together the question was, and therefore saith, *else were your children unclean*. Mr Blake's answer here is a mistake of the force of my reason, which was not from the term [*believer*] in 1 Cor. 7. 14. but from this that by their own exposition, they are unclean who are not borne of a believer, therefore they cannot be holy either by holiness of remote ancestors or the chosen nation, when the immediate parents are as wicked as the Jewes who crucified Christ. I laid the Independents had the advantage in this, and I am sure they have against Mr Blake and Mr Kutherford, and I guesse that the Assembly were sensible of it, when they appointed in the Directory the child to be presented by the Father, though I conceive that remedy will little or nothing rectify the abuse. Mr Blake saith it were worth enquiry whom I mean by officiating Priests. I tel him, non-preaching Priests made by the Bishops. Mr Blake saith, *your selfe were well aware, that every weapon that you lift up against this Protestant doctrine was forged on the Jesuites anvill, and that in the whole conflict you were necessitated to borrow help from the Philistin Artists*, when you were put upon it so say page 13. This is no undeniable Axiome; that, what all the Protestant Divines defend against the Papists, must be truth undeniable. To this I lay, I am well aware that this is a loud calumny, the contrary whereof is manifest by the many and best Protestant Divines I quote all along my Examen, and very seldom make use of a Jesuite throughout my Treatise. Nor was I put upon that speech I used, becausie I borrowed help from Papists; but because Mr Marshall spake of his virtuall consequence as undeniable, as if he had been Doctor irrefragabilis, and it is necessary when men goe about to bind men to the consent of Divines in some Churches, that we freely claime our liberty, and not become the servants of men. Mr Blake saith *I doe not know one Protestant writer that hath declared himselfe in this thing, but hath declared himself to be your adversary*. I answer, none of the Antipædobaptists are my adversaries in this; yet some of them are Protestant writers: in the point of expounding Gen. 17. 7. which is the chiefe hold for Covenant holiness, Twisse, Bayne, Ames, Downham, and many others are for me, in the point of expounding:

An Apologie for the two Treatises

134

1 Cor. 7. 14. Camerarius, Melanchthon, Musculus, Osiander, are for me. Mr Blake saith but a little before, pag. 58. Zwingli in this hand went right, in which Luther his contemporary and opposite in this thing, is charged to be defective. But saith Mr Blake, I and you have entred into Covenant to the extirpation of Popery; and I would learn of you by what character or marks it may be now discerned. I answer, not by this, that that is to be accounted Popery which all Protestant Divines oppose the Papists in; for then many things would not be counted Popery which are, nor any thing to be counted Popery till we knew all Protestant Divines oppose it an endles, impossible busines. But there is a shorter way then that, and it is that is to be counted Popery which is commonly known by that name, as the doctrine of the Popes supremacy, infallibility, the doctrine of the Mass, Transubstantiation, Bread-worship, Crosse-worship, Invocation of Saints, &c. Or if you will have a more fixed way, you may take that to be Popery which either the 39 Articles of the Church of England condemn in opposition to Papists, or is renounced in the Scottish negative Covenant, or Confession in the yeare 1581 as I remember, or what the present Parliament of England in their late Propositions to the King, Propos. 7. would have Papists abjur. Mr Blake saith, may we not require one other instance of a Popish truth standing up against an Orthodox error, besides this in controversy? That from Gen. 17. 7. 1 Cor. 7. 14. or any other Scripture Covenant-holines of believers infants cannot be proved is as well a Protestant truth, as a Popish; An Orthodox error is, oppositum in apposito. Be it that we cannot assign any one thing for truth in which Protestants generally oppose Papists; yet my speech is good, that that is no undeniabe axiome, that what all the Protestant Divines defend against the Papists, must be truth undeniabe. He that will not subscribe to this, must make the Protestant Divines doctrines against Papists, equal to the holy Scripture.

§. 14.
Of the word
[nation] Mar.
28. 19. how to
be taken.

In the 11th chapter Sect. 1. Mr. Blake subscribes to my interpretation, and conclusion, but doubts the premises on which I build it to be scarce sound, the reason he gives is, because I have expounded make Disciples out of all nations, whereas the verb is transitive, and the noun in the accusative; and therefore it is boldnesse in me to change it, that in stead of nations I may understand as many or as few

few as I list of nations, whereas Mr Blake conceives agreeable to prophecies, Psal. 2. 8. &c. that the whole of the nation is appointed to be discipled, and to be baptized, and so infants to be comprehended. I answer, my boldnesse was no other then Beza's, annot. on Mat. 28. 19, *magis nomen, id est discipulos mihi facite ex omnibus genti- bus.* The new annotations on the Bible annot. on Matth. 28. 19. teach] Gr. make Disciples of all nations] not Jewes alone, but Gentiles also; Acts 10. 34. 35. 47. nor do I any thing contrary to Grammar, as the verb is transitive, so it is used transitively by the, and it hath an accusative case after it, to wit the noun confessedly included in the verb that is made from it, and which I think none will deny to be the same with *magis nomen* used John 4. 1. and then all nations must either be put by apposition *magis nomen*, or with the Präposition *in*. Whether *in* or *magis nomen*, I stand not upon it whether be taken, but I conceive it more agreeable to the sense, and to the language to expresse it in the latter way. But then the whole of the nation, and so infants will not be included. I answer, it is true, nor can they be included. For the making Disciples all nations is by teaching them, or by preaching the Gospell to them; as the word *magis nomen* is expressed, Marcellus 6. 15. (which no man I think will have the face to deny to bee the same with this) not onely Master Marshall himselfe thus expresteth it in his Sermon pag. 35. that they shold teach the heathen and the Jewes and make them Disciples, and then baptize them; but Mr Blake subscribes to this my interpretation, by preaching the Gospell to all nations, make them Disciples. pag. 63. So that Mr Blake must needs exclude infants, except he can make them Disciples by teaching or preaching the Gospell to them. And for the prophecies he brings, I marvaile he is not ashamed to produce, Psal. 72. 11. Psal. 86. 9. to prove that that the whole of the nation even infants must be included, Mar. 28. 19. as if it were foretold that the whole of the nations even infants should come and worship before God. Parens in his Commentary on Matth. 28. 19. faith truly, *tertium mandatum est de baptizandis omnibus gentibus, hoc est sacramento baptismi initi- andis & consecrandis omnibus lis qui Christo nomen darent.*

In the second section of chapter 14. Master Blake saith, I had thought no man had equal to Bellarmine in taking paines to find a knot

§. 15.

Of M. Ruther-
fords and Mr
Blakes and
mine opinion
concerning
the rule to
know who are
baptizable.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

136

knot in a Bull-rush. But I have shewed above that Mr Rutherford hath made a knot, needfull to be untyed. I say, there can no rule be assigned whereby to know when a nation is a believing, chosen, or discipled nation, giving right to baptize infants of that nation when not. Mr Blake askes, doe you mean rules so cleare and plaine that no difficulty or case of conscience can occurre; that needs enquiry in observation of it. I antwer no, but such rules as are so cleare that a case of conscience may be resolved by them. M. Blake accuseth me as not rightly setting down his argument, because I set not down the conclusion right: I put the conclusion thus; and therefore the infants to be baptized, whereas I should have added: and the nations being discipled, then infants as part of the nation are to be baptized: To shew the causelnesse of this exception, Mr Blake pag. 20 of his birth-priviledge had said thus, The infants of any nation make up a part of the nation, and the nation where they came was to bee discipled; but set not down his conclusion, and therefore I conceiving he meant to infer thence that infants were comprized in those words, baptizing them, Matth. 28. 19. put down his conclusion thus, and therefore the infants to be baptized. Mr Blake would have discipled put into the conclusion. But I conceive still discipled should not be put in the conclusion, and the premisses were set down by himselfe, and therefore I did him no wrong. For his argument in form must be thus. They who are part of a discipled nation are to be baptized, infants are part of a discipled nation, therefore infants are to be baptized; any man may see that discipled should not be put in the conclusion, sith it is in the *medium*, *quod non ingreditur conclusionem*. Now let his major Proposition stand, and I will sublume upon Mr Blakes ground; Infidels of growne yeares are part of a discipled nation, for they are part of the nation; and if the nation be discipled, they are part of the discipled nation: therefore by Mr Blakes reason, Infidels of growne yeares are to be baptized. Mr Blake at last pag. 67. sets downe his rule, in these words they are baptized by vertue of a priviledge from their parent, not from the nation: which is plainly to renounce Mr Rutherford's assertion. I confess if my first argument against the assertion I conceive Mr Rutherford's may be answered, then the 2d. will be easilly answered as M. Blake truly observes, p. 68. In answering my 3d. Mr Blake askes, How is it that wicked parents

parents are now brought in this dispute? I answer because it was the term *Mr Rutherford* used in his assertion: not to shew my allowance of the baptisme of infants of parents not wicked, nor out of agreement with *Mr Thomas Goodwin* in this. *Mr Blake* page 69. indeavours to prove by my tenet there can be no rule set down to know that any man is baptizable, because he conceives I hold onely true beleevers before God, members of the invisible Church, vessels of mercy, redeemed ones are the men discipled to be baptized; but who are such, cannot be known. Ergo, by my opinion none are to be baptized. *M. Blake* indeavours to gather that to be my opinion out of my words, which are brought in *ob iusto collo*, against their intent, nothing to his purpose. I say that *Mr Marshalls* words in this sense are good, beleevers of every nation are the peculiar people meant; 1 Pet. 2. 9. and this is meant of the invisible Church, and that God hath not chosen simply the nation of the Gentiles, but a people out of them: Revel. 5. 7. but doe I thereby expound *Marth.* 28. 19. as if [nations] there comprehended only such elect persons and true beleevers? or doe I any where say, that such only are Disciples and to be baptized? Why then doth *Mr Blake* not onely here, but after in another chapter to wit the 14 of his book pag. 95, 96. endeavour to fasten so absurdly that upon me, when he himselfe twice in this very book p. 24. 50. acknowledgeth, that he hath heard it from my own mouth, that baptisme is rightly administered to every professour of Christ. I say pag. 158 of my *Examen*, that infants being sanctified are beleevers, and discipled of Christ; but I no where say, a sanctified person a beleever, and a Disciple to be the same, as *Mr Blake* untruly chargeth me, pag. 96. for I doe not make the termes reciprocall. Nor is that the advantage which I say the Independents have in this point, that the holiness that is the ground for the administratour to baptize, must be reall either indeed or charitably beleeved; but this is the advantage I conceive the Independents have, that whereas some will have children baptized though the parents be never so wicked: if they be a part of a beleeveng nation, or their mediate Ancestours professed the faith, the Independents have advantage against them by their own plea; from Gen. 17. 7. 1 Cor. 7. 14. as I shewed above. In like manner *Master Blake* chapter 14. page 93, because I said that Infants may by

An Apologie for the two Treatises

extraordinary power be made Disciples, as God made John Baptist leap in his mothers womb, and Balaams ass speake, inferres against all reason and candor, thus. You hold this is done by the omnipotent power of God, as usually as actuall faith and profession of it is wrought in them; as asses are made to speake with mans voice, and children in the womb leap for joy at the sensible presence of one that speaks to their mother. These you joyn together, so that this is the comfort that you leave to parents when infants beleive, make profession of their faith, asses speake, and infants in the womb know a voyce and rejoice upon hearing it, then their children may be sanctified, and dying in infancy saved. But what spirit is Mr Blake possessed with that he so unbrotherlike perverts my words to make me odious? I say that infants are sanctified by extraordinary power, not by ordinary means as hearing the word, doe I therefore make this unusual? It may be done in every infant of a beleever for ought I say to the contrary. But you make it an extraordinary accident when you use this passage, both p. 134, & 158. extraordinary accidents make not an ordinary rule. 'Tis true I use the passage in both places, but do not in either make the extraordinary accident to be an infants sanctification, but in the one an infants profession of faith, as the very words shew, pag. 134. and in the other the extraordinary revelation, as is easie to be perceived by him that reads, pag. 158 of my examen. And thus have I answered with sect. 2. ch. 11. the fourteenth chapter also of Mr Blakes book.

S. 16.

About two
sub positions
ascribed by me
to Mr Marshal
and Mr Blake
in my Examen
page 130.

Sect. 3. chap. 11. Mr. Blake chargeth me of imposing this supposition on him, that he should strongly conceit this, that Christ bid the Apostles baptize all nations after the manner that the Jewes did circumcise one nation, my meaning was that he conceived that as God appointed the Jewes to circumcise parents professing faith and their infants; so he bid the Apostles baptize beleieving parents, and their infants: I did not intend to charge him with this conceit, as if he conceived that Christ bid the Apostles set up circumcision, as he seems pag. 73. to imagine, but that he conceived they were to baptize all nations, Fathers and Infants in like manner as the Jewes circumcised Fathers and their Infants. And this I conceive still must bee his meaning, not knowing what other Covenant, and Covenant-initiating Sacrament he could meane restrained to one nation, besides the Covenant, Gen. 17. and circumcision

cumcision appointed to the Jewes. But Mr. Blake tells me this was my calumny to say he would have the commission, Mat. 28. 19. to be expounded by the precept of circumcision, Gen. 17. *hac mea t
the precept or commission; Matth. 10. 6.* I answer, Mr. Blake would have the word *nations* Matth. 28. 19. to comprehend infants, and his reason is, because the word *nation* was so taken, when the Covenant, and Covenant-initiating Sacrament was restrained to that one nation. Now I appeal to any one whether in the commission, *Matth. 10. 6.* yea or in the whole chapter, the word *nation* be taken as restrained to that one nation? nor is their commission first limited, nor is there any mention made either of Covenant or Covenant-initiating Sacrament in that whole chapter, nor a word that shewes that the word *nation* in the Apostles commission comprehended infants. And therefore I could not divine more fairely then I did what Mr. Blakes meaning should be in that obscure expression. But saith Mr. Blake you are not at the paines to make it appear how the words of Christ were to the Apostles intelligible, if the word *nation* in this enlarged Commission, must be taken in any other sense, and latitude when it was in their former limited commission when the Covenant and Covenant-initiating Sacrament was restrained to one nation. To this I answer, I took paines I think sufficient to shew how it must be understood in my Examen, S. 13. and therefore I shew how it was intelligible to the Apostles. Many interpreters have expounded the word, none that I know of expounded it by *Mat. 10. 6.* The commission *Mar. 16. 15.* is the same with *Mat. 28. 19.* and so expounds it without running to *Mat. 10. 6.* The other supposition that I conceived Mr. Marshalls argument relied on is, that the nation of the Jewes were discipled when circumcised. This Mr. Blake saith, I put on him, but he disclaims it. The truth is, I did not put it on Mr. Blake, but Mr. Marshall; though the next words speak of Mr. Blake: but not imputing to him the second, but the first supposition. As for Mr. Mar. I do not find him disclaiming it. And for that inference that Mr. Blake makes from my words, as if I conceived low thoughts of Mr. Blake and Mr. Marshall, because I say the conceit that making Disciples, *Mar. 28. 19.* is to be done by baptizing them, is so absurd that I presume none that hath any wit will entertain it, now it is as absurd to say, that the Jewes were discipled when they were circumcised,

An Apologie for the two Treatises

extraordinary power be made Disciples, as God made John Baptist leap in his mothers womb, and Balaams ass speake, inferres against all reason and candor, thus. You hold this is done by the omnipotent power of God, as usually as actuall faith and profession of it is wrought in them; as asses are made to speake with mans voice, and children in the womb leap for joy at the sensible presence of one that speaks to their mother. These you joyn together, so that this is the comfort that you leave to parents when infants beleive, make profession of their faith, asses speake, and infants in the womb know a voyce and rejoice upon hearing it, then their children may be sanctified, and dying in infancy saved. But what spirit is Mr Blake possessed with that he so unbrotherlike perverts my words to make me odious? I say that infants are sanctified by extraordinary power, not by ordinary means as hearing the word, doe I therefore make this unusual? It may be done in every infant of a beleever for ought I say to the contrary. But you make it an extraordinary accident when you use this passage, both p. 134, & 158. extraordinary accidents make not an ordinary rule. 'Tis true I use the passage in both places, but do not in either make the extraordinary accident to be an infants sanctification, but in the one an infants profession of faith, as the very words shew, pag. 134. and in the other the extraordinary revelation, as is easie to be perceived by him that reads, pag. 158 of my examen. And thus have I answered with sect. 2. ch. 1. the fourteenth chapter also of Mr Blakes book.

S. 16.
About two
suf positions
ascribed by me
to Mr Marshal
and Mr Blake
in my Examen
page 130.

Sect. 3. chap. 11. Mr. Blake chargeth me of imposing this supposition on him, that he should strongly conceit this, that Christ bid the Apostles baptize all nations after the manner that the Jewes did circumcise one nation, my meaning was that he conceived that as God appointed the Jewes to circumcise parents professing faith and their infants; to he bid the Apostles baptize beleeving parents, and their infants: I did not intend to charge him with this conceit, as if he conceived that Christ bid the Apostles set up circumcision, as he seems pag. 73. to imagine, but that he conceived they were to baptize all nations, Fathers and Infants in like manner as the Jewes circumcised Fathers and their Infants. And this I conceive still must bee his meaning, not knowing what other Covenant, and Covenant-initiating Sacrament he could meane restrained to one nation, besides the Covenant, Gen. 17. and circumcision

cumcision appointed to the Jewes. But Mr. Blake tells me this was my calumny to say he would have the commission, Mat. 28. 19. to be expounded by the precept of circumcision, Gen. 17. haec mea t
the precept or commission; Matth. 10. 6. I answer, Mr. Blake would have the word *nations* Matth. 28. 19. to comprehend infants, and his reason is, because the word *nation* was so taken, when the Covenant, and Covenant-initiating Sacrament was restrained to that one nation. Now I appeal to any one whether in the commission, *Matth. 10. 6.* yea or in the whole chapter the word *nation* be taken as restrained to that one nation where their commission was first limited, nor is there any mention made either of Covenant or Covenant-initiating Sacrament in that whole chapter, nor a word that shewes that the word *nation* in the Apostles commission comprehended infants. And therefore I could not divine more fairely then I did what Mr. Blake's meaning should be in that obscure expression. But saith Mr. Blake you are not at the paines to make it appear how the words of Christ were to the Apostles intelligible, if the word *nation* in this enlarged Commission, must be taken in any other sense, and latitude then it was in their former limited commission when the Covenant and Covenant-initiating Sacrament was restrained to one nation. To this I answer, I took paines I think sufficient to shew how it must be understood in my *Examen*, § 13. and therefore I shew how it was intelligible to the Apostles. Many interpreters have expounded the word, none that I know of expounded it by *Mat. 10. 6.* The commission *Mar. 16. 15.* is the same with *Mat. 28. 19.* and so expounds it without running to *Mat. 10. 6.* The other supposition that I conceived Mr. Marshall's argument relied on is, that the *nations* of the Jewes were discipled when circumcised. This Mr. Blake saith, I put on him, but he disclaims it. The truth is, I did not put it on Mr. Blake, but Mr. Marshall; though the next words speak of Mr. Blake: but not imputing to him the second, but the first supposition. As for Mr. Mar. I do not find him disclaiming it. And for that inference that Mr. Blake makes from my words, as if I conceived low thoughts of Mr. Blake and Mr. Marshall, because I say the conceit that making Disciples, *Mar. 28. 19.* is to be done by baptizing them, is so absurd that I presume none that hath any wit will entertain it, now it is as absurd to say, that the Jewes were discipled when they were circumcised,

An Apologie for the two Treatises

cised, and therefore I conceive Mr Blake and Mr Marshall have not any wit. But for this inference it is a farre fetched thing : I did not conceive the one so absurd as the other, nor doe yet; and therefore I might impute defect of wit to the entertainer of the one conceit, and yet not impute it to Mr Marshall and Mr Blake, for entertaining another conceit like it. Mr Blake excepts against me for laying these points had strong hold in his mind, that baptisme succeeds into the room, place, and use of circumcision ; and that the Covenant of the Gospell is all one with the Covenant made with Abraham : For if he used those words, that Baptisme so succeeds circumcision, wherefore how could I know it to bee in his mind. I answer him with words equipollent which hee useth as Birth-priviledge , page 14. what is objected against one , concludes against both : circumcision and baptisme are therefore by the Apostle promiscuously taken ; there being the same principall and maine end of both. And this is evidence enough for what I said. The other Proposition he denies not to be in his mind.

§.17.
About arguments drawn from Analogy
in positive rites & their invalidity :
and the insufficiency of M. Blakes rules.

Sect.4. ch. 11. Mr Blake makes a digression concerning arguments drawn from Analogy. And first whereas I had allowed for that which is naturall or morall in worship, an institution or command in the old Testament as obligatory to christians : upon this Mr Blake tells me, there is the same reason and like liberty in arguing by analogy in positive as in morall precepts. To this I reply , if the meaning bee that there is like reason of proving morall precepts from the old Testament as positive rites, it is most false and contrary to the 7th article of the Church of England, but if it be understood of the manner of proofe by analogy or resemblance , then I deny that wee have any liberty at all to argue from analogy or resemblance , to prove or make a dutie or command in morals or ceremonials , though I grant we may use analogy to inforce a duty before proved. For an argument to prove a thing to bee a morall dutie from the old Testament, must bee by proving the same thing , then to have been morall as Master Cowdray and Master Palmer endeavour to prove one day in seven for a Sabbath to bee morall and perpetuall , but an argument from analogy is from one thing to another , as like , for analogy or proportion is betwene , not the same but more things as like. As for the Apostles arguing, 1 Cor.9.9.

1 Tim.

3 Tim. 5.18. the Apostle doth not by bare analogy conclude ministers maintenance, but from the Lords ordinance, *I Cor. 9.v.14.* which ordinance I take to be that *Math. 10.10.* which ordinance the Apostle confirmes from common equity, which he proves by diverse instances, from *v.7. to v.14.* so that the Apostle doth no prove a morall duty by analogy between two different things, but from a generall maxime that *the labourer is worthy of his reward.* proved by sundy instances, inferres a particular truth concerning ministers. The argument *I Cor. 10.16.17.* is to prove. that they which professe Christ, may not partake of the things of Idols, from this generall truth that they which joyn in the seruice of any God they hold communion with that God, and are one with those that worship that God. this the Apostle proves by instances in the Christian, and Jewish services. So that this argument is from a generall truth proved by an induction of instances. That *Math. 12.3.4.* is onely an instance to prove that sacrifice must give place to mercy : a ceremoniall to a morall duty; not an argument from meer analogy or resemblance of things different. But what ever arguing there be in morals, certaine it is that no argument is good from bare analogy in ceremonials, or meer positives of the Jewes ; to prove, thus it was in such a rite of the Jewes, therefore it must be so in such a rite of the Christians, there's no example of such arguing in the Scriptures, and therefore I said rightly *Examen pag. 29.* To me it is a dangerous principle upon which they goe that so argue, to wit, that in meer positive things (such as circumcision and baptisme are) we may frame an addition to Gods worship, from analogy, or resemblance conceived by us betweene two ordinances ; whereof one is quite taken away without any institution gathered by precept or Apostolical example. Master Blake would knowe who they be that do so, I answer, Mr Marshall in his first argument, and five first conclusions, and virtuall command from circumcision; Master Blake birth-priviledge pag. 15. and generally all that prove Infant-baptisme, by Infant-circumcision. For circumcision and baptisme, are meer positive things; baptizing of Infants is confess'd not to have expresse institution gathered by expresse precept, or example in the new Test:and that which is alleged, is either expresse, or no precept, or example at all: and if it were to be gathered by consequence from institu-

An Apologie for the two Treatises

tion, or example Apostolicall in the new Testament, without the helpe of the precept of circumcision there would be, for as much as it concernes my part, an end of the controversie: therefore it is clear, they that argue from circumcision to baptisme, doe frame an addition to Gods worship, from analogy or relemblance conceived by them, between two ordinances: whereof one is quite taken away, without any institution gathered by precept, or Apostolicall example. But saith Master Blake. It is not barely the analogy between circumcision and baptisme, by which we inforce the baptisme of Infants, but the grounds of both circumcision and baptism. This is laid, but when the grounds are required, what are they but the analogy between baptisme and circumcision, that they are like; what's the reason of the one, is the reason of the other: and therefore what is done in the one, is to be done in the other? Now whence is this arguing but barely from the likenesse, which makes an argument meerly from analogy. If the argument were drawn from some thing proper to baptisme it were another case, but being drawne from circumcision to baptisme, it is an argument meerly from analogy. If they rest not on this, let them lay aside this argument, and sticke to precept or Apostolicall example in the new Testament. To shew the danger of this way of arguing, I thus reasoned Examen pag. 29. For if we may do it in one thing, why not in another? where shall we stay? They that read the Popish expositors of their rituals do know, that this principle hath brought in surplice, purification of women, &c. that I mention not greater matters. I desire any Learned man to set me downe wrte from Gods word, how farre I may go in my conceived parity of reason, equity or analogy, where I must stay; when it will be superstitution and will-worship when not; when my conscience may be satisfied, when not. Master Blake in answer hereto, layes downe three rules. 1. When parity of reason or analogy, doth not institute any pecece of worship, or the least part of the service of God, but onely helpes to a right understanding of the nature, use, end, exten of that which is instituted. 2. When in our reasoning from analogy, from the right understanding of any institution, or ordinance, we do not rest soley on the analogy that we find with other commands, but have our further reason for confirmation. 3. When the analogy holds full proportion in that for which it is brought, so that nothing can fairly

fairly be brought against the one, but may be also concluded against the other. To this I answere. 1 That never a one of these rules is brought out of Gods word. Not the first, for there is neither declaration of such a rule, nor example to prove that rule. The proving of excommunicating of women from Miriams shutting out of the camp, *Numb. 12. 14.* is not a Scripture collection, but a meer devise of men; the argument against nonresidence from *Ezek. 44. 8.* is good after other arguments, but without other proove is not convincing: and it is not in meer positive things but morall. The argument of the Apostle, *1 Cor. 9. 13. 14.* is not from one positive rite to another, but from an ordinance of God agreeable to common equity in the old Testament, to illustrate an ordinance in the new Testament, about a morall duty of righteousness. The second and third rules are not set downe from any declaration or example in the Scripture. 2 I lay these rules are very uncertaine, For no reason is given why they may not make a new worship, who may by their analogy extend it beyond the institution in the new Testament. yea, it will be alleaged by Papists, and others, that when they appoint Surplice, Purification, Organs, &c. they do not make a new worship, but adde circumstances to the ordinances of Christ. Yea, The second rule overthrowes all, For if we may not soley rest on the analogy; why at all? This is enough to shew that analogy hath no strength, that indeed it doth onely illustrate cannot prove; what is an argument by analogy, but an argument *ad simili?* If analogy could prove, we might rest soley on it, without any other confirmation. It is true, many desire more arguments, but in truth if it be an argument that proves, we may rely on it soley though there be no other. The third rule likewise is uncertaine and vaine. For how shall we knowe when the analogy holds full proportion? when nothing can be fairly brought against the one, but may be also concluded on the other? when is the proportion full, if onely when *omnia sunt paria*; this can never happen in analogies between the rites of *Moses* and rites of *Christ?* If when there is a parity in many things, it will be uncertaine how many parities will serve turne to make the proportion full; what force there is in an analogy when there are more disparities: And so for a rule to knowe when a thing is fairly brought, whether the rule be to be taken from Logicke, or the judgement

An Apologie for the two Treatises

judgement of the Learned. So that these rules are very uncertain.
 3 It is also uncertaine whether these rules be sufficient, whether
 there be no need of any more. For these rules will not exclude
 prooфе of imparity of ministers, Infant commuuion, &c by analog-
 gy. Or if they do the same aberration from these rules that dis-
 proves the analogy for these; will be incident to the analogy for
 Infant-baptisme. We may say Infant-communion, or imparity in
 the ministry is no more a new instituted worship, then Infant-
 baptisme; they that allege analogy for imparity of the Clergy,
 and Infant-communion rest not soly on it; it seems to be brought
 as fairely with as full proportion in the one as the other. So that
 I conclude, not onely with Master Rutherford proportions are
 weake proportions, but also that in these positive rites, and institu-
 tions they are no probations at all, but meer illustrations, and con-
 sequently the argument for Infant-baptisme from the analogy of
 Infant-circumcision is a meer nullity.

The rest of the section containes nothing but wrong inferen-
 ces from my words; I distinguish between Evangelicall promises
 and promises domesticall specially respecting Abrahams family,
If this distinction may passe then Abrahams family had no Evangelicall promises saith Master Blake, *you make faith he, an opposition between them.* But what ridiculous arguing is this? It's all one as
 to say, If gifts of grace and nature are distinguished, then they
 that have gifts of grace, can have no gifts of nature. Those things
 that are not *idem formaliter*, or *realiter*, may be in *eodem subiecto*.
 I oppose them, he saith, but how? not as contraries, but as *disparata*, which is rather a distinction then an opposition. Because I
 say, *circumcision signified that Moses Law was to be observed*, Gal. 5.3. Master Blake excepts. You are (it seems) of Mr Black-
 woods opinion, that *faith, circumcision did not bring any grace to the Jewes, but was rather a yoke or a curse*. Master Blackwood hath
 or may answer for himself. Mr Blakes inference from my words is
 a meer cavil. And that which he addes, that I make frequent use
 of Bellarmines sophistry is a meer slander. That circumcision signified
 the promise of the Land of Canaan, I had it not from Bel-
 larmine, but if from any, rather from Cameron cited by me exer-
 cit: pag. 4. or rather from Gen. 17.8. Psal. 105.11. This is enough
 in answer to that section.

concerning Infant-Baptisme.

145

S. 16.

That Mr Blake
hath not pro-
ved that In-
fants are dis-
ciples from
Mat. 18.5. nor
pertinently
alleged. 15*ai.*
49 22.

Sect. 5.ch. II. Master Blake accuseth me as not setting down his argument rightly, but the truth is, I set not downe the argument as it is in Master Blake, but as it was in Master Marshall, whose very words I alledge, and that rightly. But Master Blake thinkes he formed it to better advantage; From Matb. 10.42. Mar. 9.41. compared. I onely gather so that belong to Christ, and to beare the name of Christ, and to be a Disciple of Christ is one and the same thing. But by his leave, if he should meet with a punctuall respondent, he would and might deny his proofe. For all that he can prove from thence is, that the same person that belong to Christ, are disciples of Christ; but it is not true alwayes; quae ei- dem subiecto convenienter sunt eadem formaliter. He that should say, he that receives my servant receives me; he that receives one that belongs to me, receives me; though he speak both these of the same person, yet a servant, and one that belongs to him are not all one and the same thing: For there are other that belong to him, as wife, children, friends, besides servants. And indeed to belong to Christ, and to be a Disciple of Christ, are not one and the same thing. To be a Disciple of Christ in all the places in the four Evangelists and Acts of the Apostles, signifie no other then one that professed Christ to be his master, and followed his Doctrine, as the Disciples of John, the Pharisees, and others did follow their Doctrine; but many belong to Christ, yet uncalled, all that his Father hath given unto him, the Angels that are his Ministers belong to him, and yet cannot in the Scripture acceptation be termed Christs Disciples. But I assume saith Master Blake, that Infants are of the number of those who as Disciples in Christs account do belong to him. Matb. 18.5. I said the word ~~naidim~~ notes not alwayes an Infant, for Jairus daughter, though twelve yeare old is called ~~naidim~~ Marke 5.41.42: and yet that age might be a patterne of humilitie; seldom are children of that age ambitious as the Disciples, though they be oft impatient. I said further that Matb. 18.5. is not meant of a little child in age, and that I proved from v.3.4.6. But saith Master Blake, he is indeed a child in understanding, that doth not see that your reference to v.3.4. is wholly against you, for little child v.3.4. is taken for such a one as in age is a little child, else the speech would be inept. But Mr Blake should have heeded my wonds better, I did not parallel the word

An Apologie for the two Treatises

[little child] v.5. with [little child] v.3 4. but the phrase [one such little child] with the phrases, v.3. one that is converted; and made as a little child. v.4. one that humbles himselfe as a little child v.6. one of those little ones that beleieve in him. But saith Master Blake, Luke 9.48. it is *non tu sed tuus*. It is true, it is so. Nevertheless Beza notes thus, *sed & pro non tu sed tuus hunc puerulum, fortassis legendum tuus non tuus*; *hujusmodi puerulum: & Grotius non id est: non ut apud Matthaeum, quomodo & hic Syrus interpretatur. Tale est: amor omnibus idem.* That in *Matth. 18.5* a little child must be meant of a little child in affection, seems plaine to me by the terme *such a one*, that it is not limited to that little child, the term *is*, shewes which is as much as *quempiam* any one. And me thinkes the meaning of the words should be thus, whosoever should receive such a one as is as meane and low as a little child receiveth me, as that which followes makes me conceive. For he *that is leſſe among you*, that is, though he were as meane as a little child, *shall be great*. But were it granted that it were meant of a little child in age, how doth it follow that such a one is there a Disciple? This, if any must be the proove: He that is received in christ's name, is a Disciple. A little child may be received in Christ's name *ergo* a little child is a disciple. But of this argument, I deny the *major*; a person might be received in Christ's name, who was not a Disciple, as those that did miracles in Christ's name, and yet followed not Christ, *Luke 9.49*. But if it were so that it could be proved, that the terme Disciple is any where given to an Infant, (which neither Master Blake from *Matth. 18.5*. nor Master Marshall from *Acts 15.10*. can ever do) yet it is certaine that a Disciple *Matth. 28.19*. is such a one as is made by preaching the Gospell, as is manifest from *Mar. 16.15. John 4.1*. And I wonder that those very men that do in effect sometime confess this is not meant of Infants, when they answer the Antipædobaptists objection from *Matth. 28.19*. as Mr. Marshall pag. 44. of his Sermon, *It is said indeed, that they taught and baptiz'd, and no expresse mention of any other, that yet they should by such strained and forced inferences go about to draw a command from Matthe. 28.19. for baptizing Infants, as if they might be called there Disciples, contrary to the constant use of the word throughout the new Testament, and their own confess'd*.

concerning Infant-Baptisme,

147

fessionelswhere. Sect. 6. ch. 11. Master Blake blames me for putting his reason from *Isai 49.22* as an argument by it selfe in my exercitacion. But he might know my exercitacion set downe most of the arguments as they were urged in the conference with me, And so was the reason from *Isai 49.22*. urged in that conference as an argument by it selfe, to my best remembrance, however it were after disposed in the birth-priviledge. But saith Master Blake, the question here is not (as after your manner you mistake it) whether this text proves Infant-baptisme, but whether it gives any intimation, that Infants in the dayes of the Gospell be any members of the Church-visible, or intitled to any priviledges of the Covenant, as Christ's Disciples. I reply, The proving of that intimation tended to prove Infant-baptisme, and therefore those words were alleged for Infant-baptisme; which was that I said, not a whit mistaking the question. Now sith Master Blake contelleth that the words must needs be allegoricall, why doth he expound the terme sons and daughters of Infants, and tell us that their carriage of their little ones must be understood no otherwise then of the accessse of the Gentiles with their Infants to the Church of Christ. For if the Carriage, and noursing v. 23. be allegoricall meant of perswasions, exhortations, and such like acts, Infants could not be thus carried And so Mr Blakes allegation is but an empty sound.

Ch. 12. Master Blake goes about to justifie his speech that he used in his birth-priviledge, pag 22. that the precedent is an houſe-houſe. He that followeth the precedent, muſt baptize houſehouſe. This speech I said, I marvaile much at it, and that it is very absurd, that I say no worse of it. Master Blake tells me, I exprefſe not the reaſon of ſo much marvaile. I anſwer the terme wherfore, with the words following exprefſe this reaſon plainly, ſith as I ſaid before in houſehouſe were Infidels, if an houſe-houſe be the precedent to be followed; and he that followeth the precedent muſt baptize houſehouſe without any other qualification; then when he baptizeth the beleeving master, he muſt baptize the unbelievevng ſervant, wife, &c. for they are of the houſe-houſe. Master Blake. If you had any worse to ſay, I wonder that you had not ſpoke it, your beſt friends I beleevē will ſay that you have ſufficiently ſhewed your ſelfe absurd in language. Sure Master Blake knowes that a ſpeech may be worse censured then by terming it very absurd, I might have cal-

S. 19.
of baptizing
houſehouſe & my
censure of Mr
Blakes ſpeech
concerning it.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

148

led it sophistica, deceitfull, and that had beeene worse. My best friends can finde no abusive language of any mans person, their speeches or arguments I censure in no more absurd language then usually schollers do, and particularly Master *Gataker* doth Doctor *Ames*, and *Voetius* as I have shewed in this *Apology* above §.5. Master *Blake* addes, *I onely say some more learned then I, as learned as you have denied my words to be either absurd or heterodox.* Be it so; yet affection may blinde their eyes. But let us examine the speech. I reasoned thus, if the precedent to be followed be a housshould, then those of the housshould are to be baptizid either because of the housshould; if this be said, then the Infidell wife is to be baptizid because of the housshould, or because they professe the faith; and then the precedent is not a housshould, but a professor of faith. To this Master *Blake*, *For full answer I say, that wife and servant, as wife and servant, are in a capacity for baptisme:* if any wife and servant were in those housshoulds they were baptizid; else the Scripture would not have said the whole family was baptizid. It is sufficient that Scripture mentioning baptisme of whole housshoulds, exceptis none from a capacity of baptisme. I reply, in that which he calls a full answer, there is no answer at all to my reason; for he neither denies my distinction to be sufficient, nor doth he tell us which member he will choose in the *Dilemma*, nor how he will avoid the consequent upon his choice. And therefore his learned friends, though they were ten times learneder then my selfe, yet in this are mistaken in acquitting either the former speech, or this answer, from absurdity. But let us consider what he sayes. It is sufficient, that Scripture mentioning baptisme of whole housshoulds, exceptis none from a capacity of baptisme. I reply: Is this sufficient to make the baptizing of housshoulds the precedent, that is the pattern by which we may now baptize Infants, because Infants are not excepted? Then neither are Infidels excepted there; nor natural fooles or idiots of ripe yeares, and so are to be the precedent of baptizing. But wife and servant as wife and servant, are in a capacity for baptisme. Answer. It is not true, that wife and servant as wife and servant are in a capacity for baptisme, if [as] be taken with reduplication, and [capacity] of actuall right, but as they are professors of faith. But if it be understood thus, as wife, that is though wife, and capacity in respect of future possibility, then.

then it is true of an Infidell, of any man shall we therefore make an Infidell, or a man simply the precedent of baptizing? I said there's no reaon why it should not be laid as well, that baptizing Samaria, *Acts* 8.12. the 3000 *Acts* 2.42. all Judea *Math.* 3.5; should be the precedent as baptizing of houſholds, *Acts* 16.11. *i.e.* faith Master Blake, if Samaria be converted, all Judæa is taken for ſome conſiderable numbers out of every part of Judæa. So ſay I, the terme houſhold is taken *Acts* 16. for thoſe of the houſe that being of growne yeares profeffed the faith. And ſo there's no precedent therefor baptizing an Infant.

Chapt. 13. Mr Blake paſſing over all that I ſay to Mr Marshals ſecond argument, till pag. 145. concerning it tells me, that I might have given Mr Marshal leave to explain his own argument. And And I tell Mr Blake that ſo I did, and then did my part to ſhew what was faulty in it, ſo effectually that I conceive in his *Defence* he hath quitted it, and put another in its room, as weak as it; as I ſhewed above. But Mr Blake thinkes it is ſufficient to make the argument good, that infants of beleevers have an acceſſe in Gods ordinary way of diſpenſation, whilſt infants: Here is a new phraseology, which ſerves for nothing but to puzzle; there is no face of an argument in it, and therefore I let it paſſe. To ſhew how uncertaine the argument is from from *Math.* 19. 14. for infant-baptisme I produced *Piscators* reaons to prove that it is not cleare they were infants that were brought to Christ. These reaons I did not ſtick to, and ſo need not own what is contradictory to my expositiōn of *Math.* 18.5. before. The ſecond exception I took to the argument from *Math.* 19. 14. I delivered onely doubtfully, and yet I conceived Mr Marshals reaon not cogent, for ſome-what that Christ meant to teach by that Embleme of a little child could not be well reſembled by a ſheep, for though meekneſſe might, yet not docibleneſſe: I might have added that the ſimilitude or Embleme of a ſheep, had not ſo much *decorum* in it. But I ſtick not to that expositiōn of not including thoſe infants, as conceiving not from Mr Marshals or Mr Blakes reaon, but from the circumſtances of the thing, that Christ intended ſome extraordina-ry bleſſing to them, and declaration concerning them. As for Mr Blakes gloſſe he puts upon me, I diſclaimed it; It is his owne miſtake, not my conceit: that thoſe infants, or infants of beleevers in

§. 20.
About *Mat.* 19
14. that by the
Kingdome of
heaven is
meant the
Kingdome of
glory.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

infancy have no interest in Christ, but are without Covenant of promise, without God, without hope. But for that I said; thirdly, that there is no certainty, onely conjecture that they were infants of believers, I avow it. Mr Blake averres a certainty beyond conjecture, because Christ was minister of the circumcision, Rom. 15. 8. sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, Mat. 15. 24. carried himself otherwise to the Canaanitish woman in behalfe of her daughter, verie 22. 23. If these had had no other interest, Christ would have been as facile to others as to them. I reply, Christ was minister of the circumcision, was sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, yet cured the servant of the Centurion, the Samaritan leper, the daughter of the Syrophenician. He carried himself strangely at first to that woman, to provoke her faith, and he pleaded against her not that shee was not a beleever, but that shee was a Canaanite; if this reason prove any thing it is, that the childrens parents were Jewes, but that proves not they were beleevers; few of them beleeving on Christ, John 1.11. Against the fourth thing I say of those children that were brought to Christ, that the speech [*of such is the kingdome of heaven*] is meant of the kingdome of glory, and that this is not common to all infants of believers; Mr Blake excepts that it is meant of the visible Church, and of all infants of believers as such: now on this hinge turns the fifth exception also, and so the answer to the whole argument I determine the Kingdome of heaven to be meant of the Kingdome of glory, and I thus prove it.

1 The Kingdome of God must be understood Marke 10.14, as it is verse 15. and Lu. 18.16. as verse 17 and Matb. 19.14. as it is in both those, this I prove, because our Saviour from their estate inferrs a likenesse to them in others for the same estate; but Marke 10.15, Luke 18.17. can be understood of no other then the Kingdome of glory, the proposition being false, being understood of the visible Church; many proud men entering therein, as *Simon Magus, Diotrephes, &c.* ergo it must be understood of the Kingdome of glory.

2 From this that our Saviour directs the speech Marke 10.15. Luke 18.17. to his Disciples who were already in the visible Church, therefore the requiring a further condition to the Kingdome of God shewes he meant it of the Kingdome of glory.

concerning Infant-Baptisme.

151

3. The speech Marke 10.15. Luke 18.17. is like Mat. 18.3,4.
but there it is meant of the Kingdome of glory, ergo so here.

Deodate on Matth. 19.14. so farre are you deceived in thinking
that children by reason of their weakenesse and contemptible qua-
lities; are unworthy to be presented unto me: that contrariwise no
body is capable of my Kingdom unless he be first by the spirit of rege-
neration brought into a spirituall estate to be like a little child in
the order of nature. The new annot: on the Bible on Matth. 19.14.
yee have no reason to blame them for bringing children to me; for
they may be such as have interest to the Kingdome of heaven, as
well as others of ripe yeares: and, unlesse yee be like them, ye shall ne-
ver come there, ch. 18.3.

But saith Master Blake, Christ had never been so much displea-
sed with his Disciples for forbidding them, seeing their election and
justification was to the Disciples wholly unknown, they had a pre-
sent visible title, such as the Apostles ought to have knowne. I an-
swer, The reason of Christs anger was their hindering him in his
designe, not the knowledge they had of their present visible title:
this is but a dreame.

I added further, that Christ's action in this was extraordinary,
and so no ordinary rule for baptizing by the Publike ministry. Mr
Blake would have me consider how this can stand with that I said
before, that they that brought the Infants might do it without faith
in Christ, as the Messiah upon the fame of his miracles, w:d account
that he was a Prophet. I answer, there is no opposition, they might
conceive him to be but a Prophet, not the Messiah: and yet Christ
might act as an extraordinary Prophet, and as the Messiah, Mr
Blake sayes, this act of Christ is no direct precedent for baptisme,
but for Church-priviledges of which Infants are capable. Marke
this speech, if [but] be adversative, then Master Blake grants
that Infants are capable of Church-priviledges, not of baptisme,
which overthrowes all his dispute; but the truth is, this thing was
done to these Infants, not by reason of any visible title they had,
or to enter them into any ou'ward Church-priviledge, but to ac-
complish by his blessing, their interest in the invisible Kingdome
of God by election.

Master Blake in the close of this chapter sayes, if it were true,
that paedobaptisme had no more warrant then I conceive, yet it were

pleasur to the author to have said nothing to no. 782.

only

An Apologie for the two Treatises

152

not will-worship, but a misapplication of an instituted ordinance to a person. But I aske Master Blake, whether Infant-Communion were not will worship? whether baptizing of bells were not will-worship? and yet these are but misapplications of an instituted ordinance to a wrong subject. We have the word will-worship but once, Col.2.23. and if it be taken in the worser lense, as Protestant Divines hitherto have done (though lately Doctor Hamond at Oxford hath written a booke to prove it to be taken in the better part for a commendable thing as a free-well offering) and have made it the sinne of the Pharites Matth.15.9. and especially non-conformists, who have made every invented ceremony will-worship, then much more Infant-baptisme being worship it selfe, if it be not instituted, must be will-worship.

Chapt. 15. Master Blake examines what I say, *Examen pag. 164.* about Gods sealing. Master Marshall spake of Gods sealing the baptized; I said, God seales not to every one that is baptized, but onely to true beleevers: For his sealing, is the confirming of his promise; but God promiseth righteousness to none but true beleevers. Master Blake answers. You acknowledge baptisme to be in its nature a seale of the righteousness of faith, and to be of God, therefore in it God must seale to every baptized person, or else you must say they are not baptized. I reply: I acknowledge baptisme of professors of faith to be of God, though they be not true beleevers: and I acknowledge baptisme in its nature to be a seale of the covenant of God, but not a seale actuall, but aptitudinall; that is, all right baptism is in its nature apt to seale, as a garland hung out is to signify wine to be sold, yet actually the one signifies so onely to the intelligent, and the other onely to true beleevers. And God never seales actually till a person be a beleever. I said; As for the sealing by God upon condition persons aguize the Covenant; it is but a notion; the Scripture makes not Gods promise in the Covenant of grace conditionall in that sense. For Gods promise is for those he entets into Covenant with, that he will put hisawes in their hearts, and in their mindes will write them, Heb.10.16. Master Blake answers. If you take this of the Sacraments as the words beare, then according to your opinion none ought to be baptized, but he in whose heart the law is wrote. I answer him, By Gods sealing I doe not mean every right administration of baptisme; for though that be in its nature apt to seale

§. 21.
That God
seales not to
every person
that is rightly
baptized, that
his Covenant
of grace be-
longs onely to
the elect, that
his Covenant
is effectuall,
and leaves it
not to mans
liberty to in-
clude or ex-
clude himself.

the

the graces of the Covenant, yet actually Gods seales not but when it is administred to a beleever. It may be called a right act of the administratour according to Gods appointment, but not Gods sealing. I call Gods sealing onely when either by his spirit or oath, or outward rite, he assures his grace, as by circumcision to Abraham, Rom. 4.11. he appointed Ismael to be circumcised, but did not seale to him righteousness by faith. The inference Mr Blake makes from my words, *as if I held none baptizable, but those in whose heart Gods law is written*, hath no colour, for I do not make the administratours baptizing, or, sith they will have it so called, sealing, to be Gods sealing. God appoints the word to be preached to many hypocrites, and the preacher that assures them of the promises doth it by Gods appointment, yet God doth not assure the promises to them. I do not make him onely baptizable to whom God seales, but him whom Christ appoints to be baptized, whether God seales to him or no. Master Blake urgeth me with Bellarmines argument; *If the Sacraments be seales of grace, they are often false, and God shoule beare witnessse to a lye, and tels of the speech of some that have said, that this argument is unanswerable; unless we confesse that the seale of the Sacrament is conditionall.* I like not to call the Sacrament a conditionall seale, for that which seales doth assure, and supposeth the condition: In my apprehension, that which is called conditionall sealing is not sealing but offering, or propounding, or representing: but about this I will not contend. Yet in that sense I yeeld it to be a seale actually, I yeeld it to be a seale onely to beleevers, but I deny that because the Sacrament is in its nature a seale of grace, God doth seale always when it is rightly administred. The nature of it is to be a seale aptitudinall, not actuall; and so it is easie to answer Bellarmines argument, without crossing my speeches. But be the Sacraments seales conditionall or absolute, actuall or aptitudinall, what is this to prove that God seales conditionally in this sense, as if God left it to mans liberty, to whom he had sealed, to agnize or recognize that sealing, or to free themselves, if they please, and so nullify all; yet so as to afford them awhile the favour, and privilege of being in Covenant with him, which Master Marshall I conceived meant by his conditionall sealing, and I find not in his answer a deniali of it to be his meaning. Master Blake excepts 2-

An Apologie for the two Treatises

154

gainst a speech of mine, in which I say, That all the Sacraments of the Jewes are abrogated circumstance, and substance in whole and in part: and askes me. *Is circumcision of heart abrogated? Is all spirituall meat and drinke in Sacraments abrogated? Is Christ himselfe abrogated?* I answer, no: but withall say, these are idle questions as not crossing my speech, unlesse he can prove circumcision of the heart, spirituall meat and drinke, and Christ himselfe to be Sacraments.

Sect. 2. Master Blake would acquit this speech, *Gods Covenant of grace is common to elect and reprobates from symbolizing with Arminians*, by producing the speeches of Pareus, and Mr Ball who onely say reprobates are in Covenant with God externally, or God externally contracts with them, which is another thing. Gods Covenant of grace, is his promise of grace; and of this truly, Master Marshall in his defence page 117. multitudes were baptized, to whom God yet never gave saving graces, and therefore never promised them; for had he made a promise, he would have performed it. Master Blake makes the nature of a Covenant an agreement betweene two parties, and sayes, a promise or tender without consent, is no Covenant. How then do children Covenant at baptisme, or enter into Covenant who yeeld no consent? He saith, *Gods tender of himselfe to his people is called his Covenant. Gen. 17.7.9.* But he doth not rightly call that a tender, which was more then a tender to wit a promise. Then he objects against himselfe, that if Gods Covenant be such as he will not breake, *Jerem. 31.32.* and he hath promised to put his lawes in their inward parts, then they all to whom he makes Covenant must be elect. Answer saith he, if we take the words exactly, as in the letter of the prophecy they run, then all ministry is beaten downe, and all edification ceases. But this is item lites resolvare. The Contraremonstrantes when they urge this place for effectuall grace, understand the words exactly. But how will Master Blake understand them? I have looked over almost two leaves in answer to this in Master Blake, and cannot tell how he will understand them; nor finde I that he gives any direct answer to the objection, but wanders in impertinences. Nor knowe I how he can answer the objection without evervating the argument for effectuall grace and perverance in it. And the not teaching one another there spoken of, is

meant

meant of that obscure teaching which was under the Law.

Sect. 3. He intimates that I have misreported Master Marshall, but Master Marshall hath not himselfe denied the sense I conceived of his conditionall sealing by God to Infants, the words are plaine enough in his Sermon, pag. 49. where he talkes of Gods Covenant, and sealing, and Christs suretisship, more like Corvinus, or the Arminians, then the Scripture or Contraremonstrants. Master Blake accuseth me of joyning with Independents, and that they will have none Church members, but elect, and I no Church but that which is invisible. But I beleeve he wrongs both me and them; me I am sure, for I alwayes teach a visible profession sufficient for Chuch-membership, though I deny that every visible profestour is in the Covenant of grace; and when they will have reall saints Church members, they meane not onely such as are so before God, but such as are so in the judgement of the Church Though I thinke they are more rigid then they should be in their tenet, yet I thinke Master Blake wrongs them in this imputation.

Ch. 16. I told Mr Marshall that his speech of Anabaptists as Of Mr Blakes condemning infants as out of the state of grace, condemning all the infants of the whole Church of Christ as having nothing to doe with the Covenant of Grace, till proved by some of their testimonies I should take to be but a false accusation. Mr Blake tells me Master Marshall for a testimony needs look no further then the top of your leaf, where you say infant-baptisme is a corruption of the ordinance of baptisme; If infants be not only held from baptisme, but their baptisme is also a corruption of that ordinance, and there is no such thing as Covenant-holiness to give them any title or interest, then they are out of covenant, strangers to the promises of God, and so the doom Eph. 2.12. lyes heavy upon them. How frivilous a justification is this of an expresse and deep accusation of men of a rash and bloody sentence as condemning all the infants of the whole Church of Christ, as having nothing to do with the covenant of grace; me thinks a man that would accuse so expressely so many persons, and those christian brethren not to be contemned of so deep, so passion-provoking a charge enough to stirre up Magistrates and parents to expell and destroy such men, should produce better evidence for such a crimination, then such a farre fetcht consequence as Mr Blake here brings, to make it good

An Apologie for the two Treatises

is neither my name nor peace more tenderly regarded by Master *Blake* then upon such light inference to accuse me so deeply? I had said to Mr *Marshall* that if the covenant of grace bee rightly understood, Mr *Marshall* excludes infants as much from the covenant of grace as I doe. As for Mr *Blake* not only page 14 of his Birth-priviledge, but also page 23 of his *answer to my letter*, he expressely maintaines that the birth-right he maintaines as a fruit from the covenant of free-grace to all in the faith, and their seed only entitles to onward priviledges. How doth this stand with that which he asserts chap. 3. sect. 2. of his *answer to my letter*, page 13. *that infants of beleevers have salvation if they dye in their infancy, by vertue of the Covenant?* For if the Covenant onely entitle to outward priviledges how doth it entitle to salvation? So that to speak plainly, Mr *Blake* doth but play fast and loose, sometimes asserting a certainty of salvation from the covenant, sometimes onely a right to outward priviledges; and yet he and Mr *Marshall* stick not to declaim against *Anabaptists*, for not assuring salvation to the deceasing infants of beleevers from that covenant which Mr *Marshall* will not assert, pag. 116. *as it is a Covenant of saving grace to be made to beleevers and their naturall seed, and Mr Blake's faith, onely entitles to outward priviledges.* But we say, saith Master *Blake* that all infants and men of yeers for ought that we can find from any Scripture grounds are utterly lost that want all right of Baptisme. He might say they are in danger to be lost by reason of originall corruption, not for want of right to Baptisme; but to say they are utterly lost is more then Mr *Blake* hath ground to affirme. I have often shewed that a right to baptism is from the command of Christ, not from such covenant holiness as Mr *Blake* asserts: salvation comes from Gods election and Christs redemption. It is a meer slander, and a groundlesse crimination, wherewith Mr *Blake* chargeth me, that the position he produceth out of my book, or any other he can produce doth inferre, that all the infants of the whole Church of Christ have nothing to doe with the Covenant of grace. I challenge him, with Mr *Marshall* and Mr *Blakes* seconds Mr *Calamy* and Mr *Vines*, if they can to make that charge good; or else let Mr *Blake* and Mr *Marshall* retract it. As for Mr *Blakes* conclusion, I conceive his *Protestation* makes him deservedly the object of pity, his motions carry a sting in the tayle,

tayl, to wit a false accusation, from which I doubt not but I have acquitted my selfe by this writing. The elogy the worthy member of the house of Commons bestowes on me, and the unrighteous censure of my learned namelesse acquaintance I value not; books as meats relish differently with different palates, *pro captu lectoris habent sua fata libelli*: This apollogy will state me, and my writing better in their thoughts, if they can & will understand the truth. If not, the same spirit that hath enabled me to beare greater burthens, I trust will enable me to bear these hard censures. I hope that I shall not be wanting to the overthrow of any errors, according to my ability; paedobaptisme I am more assured then ever is a great corruption, tounded as now it is taught on very great errors, and of any service I suppose I can doe to God it is one of the chiefe which I ought to apply my selfe to, that it may be cleared to be an error. I bear as much love and reverence to M. Blake as ever, he is not despised by me though his errors be freely censured. I aimed not either in the former or in this latter writing at any grievance to him, and should be sorry this controversie should make a separation between us; though I find by experience much estrangednes in many of my former acquaintance from me. And for encountering with Mr Blake for the truths sake I held my selfe necessitated to it by reason of Mr Vines and M. Calamy their former, and latter, as I still conceive, inconsiderate plandise.

F I N I S.
